GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY

CENTRAL ARCHÆOLOGICAL LIBRARY

CALL No. 891.05 / J.A.O.S

ACC. No. 24557

D.G.A. 79
GIPN—S4—2D. G. Arch. N. D./56.—25-9-58—1,00,000.

JOURNAL

OF THE

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

EDITED BY

MAX L. MARGOLIS
Dropsie College

W. NORMAN BROWN
University of Pennsylvania

24557

VOLUME 46

891.05
J. A. O. S.

(13)

A330

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY
ADDRESS, CARE OF
YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT, U. S. A.
1926

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY, NEW DELHI.
Acc. No. 24557
Date 20. 10. 56
Call No. 913.05/J.T.A.O.S

A copy of this volume, postage paid, may be obtained anywhere within the limits of the Universal Postal Union, by sending a Postal Money Order for six dollars, or its equivalent, to The YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS, New Haven, Connecticut, United States of America.

PRINTED BY J. H. FURST CO., BALTIMORE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ABBOTT, JUSTIN E: The Bhikshugīta or Mendicant's Song . . . 289
ALBRIGHT, W. F.: Notes on the Topography of Ancient Mesopotamia 220
BARRET, L. C.: The Contents of the Kashmirian Atharva Veda, Books 1-12 8
——— The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, Book Twelve 34
——— Review of Caland's *Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba* . . . 272
BARTON, G. A.: The Problem of the Origin and Early History of the Deity Nin-ib (Nin-urta, Nin-urash) 231
——— On Binding-Reeds, Bitumen, and other Commodities in Ancient Babylonia 297
——— On the Vocalization of the Ideogram *ŠES-ABši-MA* . . . 310
——— Reviews of Wardle's *Israel and Babylon;* Langdon's *Oxford Edition of Cuneiform Inscriptions;* Gadd's *A Sumerian Reading Book, The Fall of Nineveh;* C. Bezold's *Ninive und Babylon;* Budge's *Babylonian Life and History* 314
BLAKE, FRANK R.: Review of Saleeby's *Philippine Language of Education* 61
——— Aaron Ember 182
BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE: On Vedic Dhénā, "Prayer," "Song" . . 303
BROWN, W. NORMAN: Review of Hertel's *Indische Erzähler*, etc. . 71
——— Review of Enthoven's *The Folklore of Bombay* and Margaret Macnicol's *Poems by Indian Women* 265
CLARK, W. E.: Review of Keith's *Sanskrit Literature*, and Nariman, Jackson, and Ogden's *Priyadarśikā* 76
——— Some Misunderstandings about India 193
——— Review of Thompson and Spencer's *Bengali Religious Lyrics* 270
COOMARASWAMY, ANANDA: The Indian Origin of the Buddha Image 165
——— Review of B. Bhattacharyya's *The Indian Buddhist Iconography* 187
——— Review of K. de B. Codrington's *Ancient India* 253
GAVIN, F.: Some Notes on Early Christian Baptism 15
GEHMAN, H. S.: Review of Thompson's *The Gospel of St. John according to the Earliest Coptic Manuscript* 286
GRAY, LOUIS H.: A List of the Divine and Demonic Epithets in the Avesta 97
GRIFFIS, W. E.: Review of Haushofer's *Japan* 81
HITTI, P. K.: Review of C. F. Murgotten's *The Origins of the Islamic State* 274
——— Review of Muhammad Kurd-'Ali's *Kitāb Khiṭaṭ al-Shām* . 321
HOPKINS, E. WASHBURN: The Original Rāmāyaṇa 202
HUME, E. H.: Note on the adaptation of a Chinese character to political change 56
JOHNSON, H. M.: Review of Hertel's *Literature of the Shvetāmbaras* 75
——— Reviews of Helmuth v. Glasenapp's *Der Jainismus* and C. D. Dalal's *Lekhapaddhati* 268

KENT, R. G.: Review of Enno Littmann's *Morgenländische Wörter im Deutschen* 248
——— Review of C. Autran's *Introduction à l'étude critique du nom propre grec* 249
——— Review of Meillet's *Trois Conférences sur les Gâthâ de l'Avesta* 273
KRAELING, C. H.: A Mandaic Bibliography 49
LUTZ, H. F.: A Stone Group of Amset and Hapi 312
MANNING, C. A.: The Legend of Kostryuk 23
MARTINOVITCH, N. N.: Review of A. Vahid Bey's *A Condensed Dictionary, English-Turkish* 185
——— Reviews of H. Ritter's *Karagös* and C. E. Wilson's *The Haft Paikâr* 284
MICHELSON, T.: Reviews of D. R. Bhandarkar's *Asoka* and Alfred C. Woolner's *Asoka Text and Glossary* 256
MONTGOMERY, JAMES A.: Alleged intensive noun-formations in the Semitic 56
——— Reviews of André's *L'Islam*, Lammens' *La Syrie*, Gaudefroy-Demombynes' *Le pèlerinage à la Mekke*, Almuḳtaṭaf, and Jirban's *Al-badâ'i'* 88
MORGENSTERN, J.: Review of Löhr's *Priesterkodex in der Genesis* . 82
OLMSTEAD, A. T.: Review of Schnabel's *Berossus* 85
PORTER, L. C.: Review of Hodous's *Chinese Buddhism* 78
SCHMIDT, N.: Daniel and Androcles 1
——— Is Canticles an Adonis Litany? 154
——— The Manuscripts of Ibn Khaldun 171
——— Review of *The Song of Songs. A Symposium*, edited by Wilfred H. Schoff 189
STEPHENS, F. J.: Notes on Cappadocian Tablets 179
TORREY, CHARLES C.: An Inscription of Eliba'al, King of Byblos . 237
——— A Specimen of Old Aramaic Verse 241
TUTTLE, E. H.: Dravidian Notes 177, 309
——— Armenian *hariur;* Sanskrit *sṭhīv* 60
WORRELL, W. H.: Review of Gairdner's *The Phonetics of Arabic* . 318

LIST OF BOOKS REVIEWED

ANDRÉ: L'Islam (J. A. Montgomery) 61
AUTRAN, C.: Introduction à l'étude critique du nom propre grec (R. G. Kent) 249
BEY, A. VAHID: A Condensed Dictionary, English-Turkish (N. N. Martinovich) 185
BEZOLD, C.: Ninive und Babylon (G. A. Barton) 317
BHANDARKAR, D. R.: Asoka (T. Michelson) 256
BHATTACHARYYA, B.: The Indian Buddhist Icinography (A. Coomaraswamy) 185
BUDGE, E. A. WALLIS: Babylonian Life and History (G. A. Barton) 318
CALAND, W.: Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba (L. C. Barret) . . 272

CODRINGTON, K. DE B.: Ancient India (A. Coomaraswamy) . . . 235
DALAL, C. D.: Lekhapaddhati (H. M. Johnson) 270
ENTHOVEN, R. E.: The Folklore of Bombay (W. N. Brown) . . . 265
GADD, C. J.: A Sumerian Reading Book; The Fall of Nineveh (G. A. B.) 316
GAIRDNER, W. H. T.: The Phonetics of Arabic (W. H. Worrell) . 318
GAUDEFROY-DEMOMBYNES: Le pèlerinage à la Mekke (J. A. Montgomery) 88
GLASENAPP, HELMUTH v.: Der Jainismus (H. M. Johnson) . . . 268
HAUSHOFER, K.: Japan (W. E. Griffiis) 81
HERTEL, J.: Indische Erzähler, etc. (W. N. Brown) 71
——— Literature of the Shvetāmbaras (H. M. Johnson) 75
HODOUS, L.: Chinese Buddhism (L. C. Porter) 78
JIRBAN, J. J.: Al-badâ'i' waṭ-ṭarâ'if (J. A. M.) 92
KEITH, A. B.: Classical Sanskrit Literature (W. E. Clark) . . . 76
KURD-'ALI, MUHAMMAD: Kitāb Khiṭaṭ al-Shām (P. K. Hitti) . . 21
LANGDON, S.: Oxford Edition of Cuneiform Inscriptions (G. A. B.) 315
LAMMENS, H.: La Syrie (J. A. M.) 88
LITTMAN, ENNO: Morgenländische Wörter im Deutschen (R. G. Kent) 248
LÖHR: Priesterkodex in der Genesis (J. Morgenstern) 82
MACNICOL, MARGARET: Poems by Indian Women (W. N. B.) . . 92
MEILLET, A.: Trois Conférences sur les gâthâ de l'Avesta (R. G. K) 273
MURGOTTEN, C. F.: The Origins of the Islamic State (P. K. Hitti) 274
NARIMAN, JACKSON and OGDEN: Priyadarśikā (W. E. C.) . . . 77
RITTER, H.: Karagös (N. N. M.) 284
SALEEBY, N. M.: Philippine Language of Education (F. R. Blake) 61
SCHNABEL, P.: Berossus (A. T. Olmstead) 85
SCHOFF, WILFRED H.: The Song of Songs. A Symposium (N. Schmidt) 189
THOMPSON, E. J.–SPENCER, A. H.: Bengali Religious Lyrics (W. E. C.) 270
THOMPSON, H.: The Gospel of St. John according to the Earliest Coptic Manuscript (H. S. Gehman) 286
WARDLE, W. LANSDELL: Israel and Babylon (G. A. B.) 314
WILSON, C. E.: The Haft Paikar (N. N. M.) 284
WOOLNER, ALFRED C.: Asoka Text and Glossary (T. M.) . . . 264

MINOR REVIEWS 94
BOOKS RECEIVED 323
NOTES OF THE SOCIETY 96, 192, 327
NOTES OF OTHER SOCIETIES, ETC. 96, 192, 328
PERSONALIA 288
PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY AT PHILADELPHIA 1926 329
PROCEEDINGS OF THE MIDDLE WEST BRANCH AT CHICAGO 1926 . . 358
LIST OF MEMBERS 364

ILLUSTRATION

A STONE GROUP OF AMSET AND HAPI 312

DANIEL AND ANDROCLES

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

THE OLD GREEK VERSION, preserved in Codex Chisianus, probably exhibits the story of Daniel in the lion's den in the earliest form known to us. Its claim to be derived from Origen's *Tetrapla* is borne out by the version of Paul of Tella found in Codex Ambrosianus Syro-Hexaplaris. Theodotion's version seems to have been based on one already extant toward the end of the first century A. D. The daughter-versions—Old Latin, Coptic, Ethiopic, Gothic, Armenian, Slavonic—were made from Theodotion whose text took the place of the Vetus Graeca in the great codices. MSS, daughter-versions and patristic quotations furnish an extensive apparatus criticus for the restoration of Theodotion. The Syriac Peshita, like Theodotion, represents an Aramaic text closely resembling the Masoretic, and in spite of some curious variants in the Latin Vulgate, Jerome's text seems to have been quite similar.

The marked differences between the Vetus Graeca and this text officially recognized by synagogue and church have attracted little attention among scholars and, when referred to at all, have generally been explained either by negligence in copying or intentional changes in Codex Chisianus or by alterations, due to the same causes, in the Aramaic text from which the version was made.[1] Neither explanation is very plausible. A careful comparison has led the present writer to the conviction that the old version rests on an Aramaic text, and that this text was earlier than the one represented by our MSS of the Hebrew Bible and its ancient renderings.

In the Vetus Graeca, Darius appoints three presidents and has in mind making one of them, Daniel, chief ruler under himself of the empire. Jealous of Daniel, the other two plan to ruin him through his religion. In vs. 3 they are spoken of as *τοὺς δύο ἄνδρας*, in vs. 4 as *οἱ δύο νεανίσκοι*, in vs. 12 as *οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι*, and in vs. 24 as

[1] A notable exception is R. H. Charles who, in his *Commentary on Daniel*, recognizes the importance of the Old Greek version and uses it in emending the Masoretic text. This scholar, however, does not observe that it is as valuable in Ch. vi as in Chs. iii-v.

οἱ δύο ἄνθρωποι ἐκεῖνοι οἱ καταμαρτυρήσανες τοῦ Δανιήλ. These two men take counsel to secure from Darius a decree forbidding for thirty days prayer and supplication to any god without the king's permission. For this seems to be the meaning of לָהֵן מִנָּךְ מַלְכָּא (vs. 8 Aram.) = "except from thee (by thy authority), O King." Such a prohibition of a foreign cult would accomplish their purpose, as they knew Daniel would not desist from worshipping his own god. The two presidents (סרכין) obtain without difficulty the king's sanction of this edict. Having observed that Daniel continued to pray three times a day with his windows open toward Jerusalem, the two men then appear before the king, accuse their colleague, and adjure Darius by the law (δόγματα = דת) of the Medes and Persians not to change the decree. The Aramaic text probably read מוֹמִינָן לָךְ בְּדָת מָדַי וּפָרַס; cf. the Syriac versions of Matth. xxvi, 63. The Persian loan-word *dat* means law or religion. The king is asked to swear by the sacred book of his religion, as a Jew would swear on the Torah, the Christian on the Bible, the Moslem on the Koran, that he will not rescind the decree, as he undoubtedly might do, were he not bound by such an oath. Late at night Daniel is cast to the lions, a stone is placed at the entrance of the den, and a seal put upon it. There is no indication that the den (גבא) is a subterranean pit, and no reference to its bottom (אַרְעִית גֻּבָּא Aram.). The king takes no food and is unable to sleep. Wondering whether Daniel might yet be alive, he goes to the den early in the morning, taking with him some satraps as witnesses, finds Daniel unharmed, and releases him. The ordeal has been successful. But the two men who had accused him, with their wives and children, are thrown into the den and consumed by the lions. Thereupon the king proclaims himself a convert to Daniel's god and orders him to be worshipped throughout the empire. The variations from this simple form of the story in the Masoretic text are obviously additions and embellishments to exaggerate the wickedness and folly of the plot, emphasize the judgment, enhance the miracle, and adorn the tale. The story is so shaped as to give the impression that all the great officials of the kingdom take part in the proceedings, and with their wives and children perish as a result. The satraps of 120 provinces, governors, councillors and judges are engaged in encompassing the

ruin of Daniel. They obtain a decree that prohibits not only the worship of any god without the king's approval but of every god, and indeed forbids even any requests to be made of any man for a period of thirty days. This whole crowd of officials spy on Daniel. They rush in and out of the palace, asking for the decree, and reminding the king that he has made it and that no edict made by the king can be changed, for the law of the Medes and Persians cannot be altered. Additional poignancy is given to the king's helpless grief by his abstinence from concubines during the night. When Daniel has been found intact, and his enemies are punished, it is the whole glory of the empire that perishes, the presidents, the satraps, the councillors, the judges, and their wives and children. A last delicious touch is added by their being slain by the lions "or ever they reached the bottom of the den."

This tendency to expansion continued. In the appendix to the story of Bel and the Dragon[2] we learn that the number of lions was seven and that Daniel was in the den seven days, and the lions are given no food. On the sixth day Habakkuk received orders to go to Babylon with food for Daniel. As he did not know the way or where the den was, the spirit took him by the hair and carried him through the air to Babylon and to the den, where he set before the prophet, on the seventh day, the food he had brought.

Beyond the Old Greek we cannot go with certainty. It is not impossible that the original Aramaic text was even shorter. The name "Darius" may be an addition, as Lagrange[3] has suggested. Torrey[4] has plausibly maintained that the Aramaic story book was written in the middle of the third century B. C. There is no allusion to Antiochus IV Epiphanes under the guise of a Persian king. The unwillingness of the king to sacrifice Daniel is sufficient

[2] Cp. for this fragment, found both in Vetus Graeca and Theodotion, Whitton Davies in R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, I, 1913, p. 622 ff. It is interesting to observe that here also Theodotion's text exhibits the same tendencies as in Ch. vi. It adds to the Vetus Graeca the statements that "food was not then given to them" (the lions) and that Daniel's enemies were not only devoured but devoured "in a moment before his face."

[3] *Revue Biblique Internationale*, N. S., I, 1904, pp. 501 ff.

[4] 'Notes on the Aramaic Part of Daniel' in *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Science*, 1909, p. 244. He places its composition "not before or after the reign of Ptolemy III (247-223 B. C.)."

evidence against this untenable theory. Attempts to suppress the freedom of worship may have been made in the Persian empire before the Arsacidae. The attitude of the early Achaemenian kings cannot be quoted to the contrary. If the "law of the Medes and the Persians" actually refers to a sacred book, that may have a distinct bearing on the date of some of the later parts of the Avesta. While in Jewish folk-lore extraordinary actions are occasionally attributed to asses, bears, lions, and serpents, and strange powers over such beasts are exercised by holy men, some stories no doubt reflect also real observations of the habits of animals. That "God stopped the lions' mouth" may, after all, have originally meant nothing more than that the lions did not eat Daniel, just as the statement that Yahwe opens the windows of heaven or closes them only means that it rains or does not rain. And the reason why the lions were first supposed not to have touched the prophet may have been the observed fact that lions in captivity which are fed in the day do not hunt for prey during the night, but sleep, and in that sleep, as numerous witnesses affirm, are not aware of the presence of human beings near them, since their scent is much inferior to that of other animals, or inclined to attack a quiet man, if they wake up and find him. It may have been a providential escape rather than a miracle that the story-teller first meant to celebrate.

A similar recognition of observed peculiarities of lions probably lies at the basis of the story of Androcles, and possibly also that of Thecla. Aulus Gellius[5] relates that he had read in Book V of Apion's Αἰγυπτιακά this author's account of a remarkable personal experience. When Apion once was in Rome, possibly in 40 A. D., and went to the Coliseum to see a slave defend his life against a huge Numidian lion, he witnessed the spectacle of the lion walking up to the man, showing at first a certain amazement, then apparently recognition and joy, licking his face, and allowing him to caress him. The story was told "*circumlataque tabella*" to the audience of how the slave had run away and in the desert entered a lion's den, freed the lion from a splinter in the paw, and lived with him until caught by Roman soldiers, who brought him to Rome where he unexpectedly found his former friend of the desert.

[5] *Noctes Atticae*, IV, xiv.

There is to-day a respectable amount of well authenticated information that throws light upon such an altogether possible episode. Carl Hagenbeck [6] tells of the lion called Triest exhibited at Chicago in 1903 and at St. Louis in 1904, from whose paw a huge splinter was taken out with clippers, the lion enduring with great patience the operation and showing deep gratitude afterwards. He also relates numerous instances of his seeing lions in other menageries, after many years, whose joy at meeting him again was expressed in the most touching manner. Frank Charles Bostock [7] tells similar tales. That many Christians thrown to the lions were naturally consumed by them without regard to their pacific faith and gentle character is the unquestioned testimony of history which is inclined to blame the keepers rather than the beasts. But it is possible that the stories, growing more and more into the marvelous, of lions sparing these Christians have also a foundation in fact. It has often been observed that lions kept in cages, when they are brought out before an audience, show a certain bewilderment and a desire to take to flight rather than to fight. It may well be that on some occasion, seeing the calm behavior of the little group of Christians in the arena, a lion would at first hesitate and even refuse to attack. Such an experience, looked upon as a marvel, may then have been told in increasingly glowing colors in honor of the martyr. Intrinsically, there is nothing improbable in the tale told of Thecla [8] that a lioness licked her feet and fought with a bear attacking her. It is the accumulation of beasts that makes us pause. But it is significant here also, that the Greek text is very much simpler, while the Syriac text shows a considerable expansion.

This paper has been written with no apologetic interest to prove the historical character of the alleged experiences of Daniel, Androcles or Thecla, but in order to show how such stories have grown more wonderful in the hands of copyists, and how the habits of lions, to some extent observed in antiquity and more closely studied by hunters and trainers in modern times, may have assisted in giving rise to tales long supposed to have rested solely on pious imagination.

---

[6] *Von Tieren und Menschen. Erlebnisse und Erfahrungen*, Berlin, 1908.

[7] *The Training of Wild Animals*, New York, 1903.

[8] 'Acta Pauli et Theclae' in *Acta Apostolorum Apocryphorum*, I, 258 seq.

In a note on 'The Two Youths in LXX to Dan. 6,' JAOS 41, p. 316 f., Professor Montgomery expresses the view that *οἱ δύο νεανίσκοι* is an absurdity, because they were not 'boys' as the ילדים in Dan. 1:4 (Syr. מלא), and that these words 'appear to be an arrant insertion.' As the translator uses *ἄνδρες* in vs. 4, and *ἄνθρωποι* in vss. 12 and 24, obviously for גבריא, he can scarcely have felt that there was anything absurd in referring to them in vs. 5 as *νεανίσκοι*. Nor is there any reason why he should. He probably read עלמיא in his Aramaic text, and this word means 'servants' as well as 'youths.' The Targum to Esther ii, 2 renders נערי המלך with עולמי דמלכא (Syr. עלימוהי דמלכא), and these were the king's servants, משרתיו (Trg. משומשנוהי Syr. משמשנוהי Gk. *διάκονοι*); 'boys' were not entrusted with selecting beauties for the royal harem from which a queen might be chosen. There is no evidence that *οἱ δύο νεανίσκοι* is an insertion, 'arrant' or otherwise, by a scribe remembering Zerubabel in I Esdras iii, 4. On the contrary, the later reference to 'the two men' requires that they should have been mentioned before as originators of the plot. That the subject follows the verb does not mark it as a gloss, and the designation of the two officials is altogether unobjectionable.

Dr. Montgomery himself thinks that "the earliest form of the story may have made the two men the sole conspirators." If so, the Vetus Graeca has obviously retained this important feature of the original, and there is no ground for suspecting that its appearance in this old version is due to an arbitrary rationalization on the part of the translator. The transposition, excision, and conjectural emendation, by which it is proposed to bring the version into harmony with the Masoretic text rather than with what is admittedly more likely to be "the earliest form of the story," seem to be quite unnecessary.

Dr. Montgomery, like Bludau,[9] assumes that there were two distinct recensions of the Aramaic text in Chs. iii-vi, and that the Masorah represents the earlier of these. The resemblance between the two is in the main so close, even in these chapters, that one would then have to be looked upon as a revision of the other. But the occasional differences do not give the impression of being the result of a conscious effort to remove, from a rationalistic stand-

[9] *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Daniel*, 1897.

point, all improbabilities. In that case more thoroughgoing changes would be expected, and a better ordered text. Nor does Dr. Montgomery charge the reviser of the Aramaic text with rationalizing; the onus falls, in his opinion, on "the rationalistic Greek translators." Yet the Vetus Graeca seems to be a no less slavish rendering of an Aramaic original than Theodotion. It was probably made from an already somewhat corrupt text in a state of fluctuation. Whether it is nearer, in form as well as in age, to the first Aramaic draft is, of course, a matter of subjective judgment. To the present writer the probability seems decidedly greater that, here as in numerous other instances, the Old Greek version bears testimony to an earlier type of text, while the gradually accruing alterations registered in the Masoretic text and Theodotion reveal the natural tendency to expansion, elucidation, and embellishment.

THE CONTENTS OF THE KASHMIRIAN ATHARVA-VEDA BOOKS 1-12

LEROY CARR BARRET
TRINITY COLLEGE, HARTFORD

ELEVEN BOOKS of the Kashmirian recension of the Atharva-Veda (i. e. the Atharva-Veda according to the school of the Pāippalādas) have now been published, the twelfth book is ready, and thus very nearly one-half of the material of that text is accessible for study. Inasmuch as it shows considerable agreement with and marked differences from the more familiar recension of the school of the Śāunakīyas (often called the vulgate) a preliminary examination of its contents may well be made.

The text of the AV in the Ś school is divided into 20 books: the last book is a late addition taken almost entirely from the Rig Veda for ritualistic use, and Book 19 too is a supplementary collection. The first 18 books are arranged in three grand divisions: (1) books 1-7 contain miscellaneous short hymns (the longest has 18 stanzas) and in books 1-5 there are stanza norms which rise regularly from four to eight: (2) books 8-12 contain miscellaneous long hymns (the shortest has 21 stanzas): (3) books 13-18 are characterized by a general unity of subject matter within each book.

The text of the AV of the Pāipp school consists also of 20 books but the arrangement differs from that of the Ś school; and it presents somewhat more material, probably about 6500 stanzas as against the approximately 6000 stanzas of the Ś text with its two supplementary books 19 and 20 included. In the Pāipp text books 1-13 contain miscellaneous short hymns, the stanza norms in books 1-9 increasing regularly from four to twelve, while in books 10-13 the norms, if they exist, seem to run irregularly between ten and sixteen.

"Books 1-7 of the Śāunakīya reappear for the most part in AVP; 8-14 almost completely. Of 15 there is only the beginning; 16 and 17 appear for the most part. On the other hand the funeral hymns, book 18, are wanting entirely. Of the two supplementary books, 19 and 20, the latter including the *kuntāpa*-hymns is wanting in AVP, except those stanzas which are not *kuntāpa* and are not borrowed from the RV; book 19 with the exception of about 12 of

its 72 hymns is scattered through the AVP, showing that this supplement to the Śāunakīya is largely derived from its sister-śākhā. The arrangement of the two Vedas is to a certain extent on parallel lines: books 1-5 of the Śāunakīya are contained in 1-9 of AVP; books 8-11 in the large book 16; book 12 in 17; books 13, 14, 16, 17 in 18: the one notable divergence concerns 6 and 7 of the Śāunakīya: they appear in 19 and 20 of AVP. The variations between the two texts range all the way from inconsiderable variants to complete change of sense."[1]

In addition to the large body of material which Pāipp and Ś have in common there is a goodly amount of matter in Pāipp which is not in Ś but is also in texts other than Ś, and then there is a large amount of material not known in any text other than Pāipp: the first twelve books of Pāipp have 430 hymns, 3126 stanzas, and of these 1538 stanzas are given for the first time in this text.

The very varied themes of the hymns in AVŚ have been classified by Bloomfield[2] in fourteen groups of which the last two do not come under consideration here: we now turn to a consideration of the hymns in Books 1-12 of the Pāipp as distributed through the twelve groups.

1) *Charms to cure diseases and possession by demons.* In this group I put thirty-six hymns of Pāipp which are also in Ś and thirty-seven which are not in Ś. The charms of this sort are numerous in the AV and give a variegated picture of primitive medicine, where cures are wrought by symbolic practices or with amulets, many of which are vegetable. Atharvan charms against fever have attracted attention because of their rather full statements of symptoms. Of the six hymns in Ś dealing with fever three appear in Pāipp Books 1-12 and there are two new hymns on the same subject. Three hymns of Ś are against worms; these appear in Pāipp Books 1-12, and three new hymns of the same intent appear. There are in Ś eight hymns against poisons particularly of snakes; five of these occur in Pāipp Books 1-12 (others elsewhere in the same version) and twenty new hymns of this intent occur in the same books. It is a striking feature of the contents of the edited part of the Kashmirian AV that over half

[1] Bloomfield, *The Atharva-Veda*, p. 15. Written before publication of any part of Pāipp but needs only slight modification.

[2] *The Atharva-Veda*, p. 57.

of the new curative charms are against poison but probably it is of no great significance.

2) *Prayers for long life and health.* Pāipp in Books 1-12 presents sixteen hymns of this sort which occur in Ś but adds only three new ones to the group: one of these is a variation of some formulae which are given in two Yajur-Veda texts in connection with a sacrifice to the all-gods.

3) *Imprecations against demons, sorcerers, and enemies.* Hostile human sorcerers and dangerous demons look alike to the user of Atharvan charms. One cannot always assign hymns to this class with certainty because they verge toward remedial charms, charms pertaining to women, charms pertaining to royalty, charms for prosperity, etc. In the Ś version about seventy-five hymns may be classified here; in Pāipp Books 1-12 seventy-seven of the sort occur according to my judgment, and as Books 19 and 20 of Pāipp have a good many more we may well say that the Kashmirian AV contains considerably more imprecations than Ś. Of the imprecations which appear in Ś twenty-five occur also in Pāipp Books 1-12. Among these is Ś 4. 16 a hymn much admired for its fine statement of divine omnipresence and omniscience and often compared to the imprecatory psalms of the Hebrews: another is Ś 5. 3 (= RV 10. 128; TS 4. 7. 14) called a vihavya hymn, that is a prayer to attract the gods away from others' sacrifices to one's own. Fifty-two of the imprecations in Pāipp Books 1-12 do not occur in the vulgate: one of these is a vihavya built up out of RV stanzas with additions, another is against ghrāṇās " smells, odors," and it seems to be against foul odors as something demoniacal, but it is without parallel. Six of these new hymns are repetitious prose formulae and two others are formulaic metrical stanzas; all eight suggest Yajur Veda and two do have parallels in such texts: they are Pāipp 2. 53, 54, 68, 82, 84; 4. 8; 7. 13, 20.

4) *Charms pertaining to women.* About thirty such charms appear in the Ś version, in the first seven books: they are mostly love charms meant to make attractive the user and to gain the affection of the beloved, charms to get a husband for a woman, to maintain wedded bliss, to bring about successful conception, to procure conception of a male child, to promote easy parturition; there are also incantations against rivals and some to deprive a

woman of fecundity or a man of virility. In its Books 1-12 Pāipp includes ten of these charms which appear in Ś, and has twenty-seven others of similar import.

5) *Charms to secure harmony, influence in the assembly,* etc. Of this group Pāipp in Books 1-12 has two which are in Ś and seven which are new.

6) *Charms pertaining to royalty.* The hymns of this group deal with the election and consecration of kings, with the promotion of their strength and splendor, and with warfare, arms, and armies. The first twelve books of Pāipp present in this group twenty-one hymns which are also in Ś, covering the general range of the group: in the same books the Pāipp gives twenty-one hymns which are not in Ś, and it seems worth noting that seven of these are in Book 10 which has only sixteen hymns. About half of the new hymns of this group in the Pāipp are charms for strengthening a king or kingdom or extending his domain and the rest might fairly be said to be against kings' enemies: the Kashmirian text adds very little in this group.

7) *Prayers and imprecations in the interest of the Brahmans.* In the AV the claims of the Brahmans are at the highest point, with their insistence on calling themselves gods, their curses against any who violate them or their possessions, and their intense desire for dakṣiṇā, "fees": but they are also represented as desiring the good will of men, and eager for thorough learning in the Veda. Of the hymns of this class which are in Ś the Pāipp has eight: three of these have to do with Vedic learning; one (7. 9 = Ś 5. 7) is a flattering address to "Grudge" begging her to absent herself; another is a dialog between Varuṇa and Atharvan (typical priest) about a cow which Varuṇa having given proposes to take back. There are fourteen hymns of this group in Pāipp which are not in Ś though material known in Ś is embodied in some of them: most of these new hymns deal with dakṣiṇā, praising the bestower and exalting the efficacy of the gift, which in several instances is a mess of rice-porridge. The four hymns 9. 15, 17-19 have most of the matter in Ś 6. 17-19 rearranged and with new stanzas added; these hymns tell of the dire results to any one who harms the Brahman or his wife or withholds a cow from him.

8) *Charms to secure prosperity and freedom from danger.* Hymns of this character are frequent in all the Vedas for the poets and priests were very practical; in the AVŚ they make more than one-fifth of the entire collection and in Pāipp Books 1-12 the proportion is very much the same. "House and home, field and river, grain and rain, cattle and horses, trading and gambling, journeying and returning, serpents and vermin, furnish the special themes for these prayers and charms. And over it all is the still more persistent outcry after wealth and progeny, exemption and protection from calamity and danger."[3] In Books 1-12 the Pāipp has forty-nine hymns of this sort which are also in Ś: among them the group of seven, Ś 4. 23-29, known as mṛgāra hymns; also Ś 3. 10, which is divided into three in Pāipp, to Ekāṣṭakā who is the personification of a particular lunar day; also Ś 4. 33 (= RV 1. 97 et al.) known as the apāgha hymn. In its first twelve books the Pāipp also has forty-four hymns of this sort which are not in Ś.

9) *Charms in expiation of sin and defilement.* Much of the Atharva-Veda was composed for people holding primitive conceptions: sin was not merely a transgression of divine law but an independent something communicable by contact just as disease is contagious; strange happenings were ominous and needed expiation just as sin did. Pāipp in Books 1-12 presents only a few charms of this class, but there are more in the unedited portions. Of the hymns of this group which are in Ś three appear in the first twelve books of Pāipp and there are eight others; of these latter two are given in full in the Kāuśika-sūtra in its sections on omens and portents, one for a case of fire in a village and the other for a case of mistake in weaving.

10) *Cosmogonic and theosophic hymns.* A goodly number of these hymns appear in the vulgate text, and their philosophising seems rather remote from ordinary witchcraft spells, but they really belong to the AV: some probably were included because of the Atharvans' claim that brahma as a whole was their special province, but Edgerton[4] has forcibly set forth his opinion that their presence is due to the similar aims of the ordinary Atharvan charms and the Vedic higher thought the very essence of which latter is "that it hopes to gain practical desiderata by acquiring

[3] Bloomfield, *The Atharva-Veda*, p. 80.

[4] *Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield*, p. 117 ff.

knowledge of the esoteric truth about things." Fifteen such hymns appear in Pāipp Books 1-12 and nine of these occur also in Ś: two of these nine are the well-known puruṣa hymn (= RV 10. 90) and the hymn to the unknown god (= RV 10. 121).

11) *Ritualistic and general hymns.* The hymns of the Rig, Sāma, and Yajur-Vedas were recited as accompaniment to the greater sacrifices where three fires were used and priests with specialized functions administered an elaborate ritual: the Śrāuta-sūtra for each of these Vedas indicates just when and where in the ceremony each stanza of its Veda is to be employed. The Atharva Veda has a Śrāuta-sūtra, the Vāitāna; but it is a late and imitative production and its testimony is not always decisive as to the employment of a hymn in Śrāuta rites; furthermore the content of a hymn does not always give clear indication of its use in such rites, while the Kāuśika-sūtra, the Atharvan manual of domestic rites, may indicate its employment for some other purpose: so it is not easy to be sure that a hymn of the Atharva-Veda was used at Śrāuta sacrifices. However there are hymns in Ś which were doubtless used at these greater sacrifices and of these five appear in Pāipp Books 1-12; but there are in the same books of Pāipp twenty-four hymns not known in Ś which I would place in this group. Thus Pāipp 1. 51 and 1. 102 are connected with sacrifices at new moon or at full moon, 5. 15 would be used at morning or evening oblations, 5. 16 at a goṣṭoma, 5. 28 at agnidheya: two, 9. 21 and 12. 7, are prose litanies which seem to belong in this group; and finally there are five hymns which Pāipp shares with RV but not with Ś which would seem to belong here.

12) *Books dealing with individual themes* (books 13-18 of AVŚ). Because of the arrangement of its materials the Kashmirian Atharva Veda has practically nothing in this group in its first twelve books: at 1. 34 and 35 it has two small sets of prose formulae which are connected with the wedding stanzas in Kāuśika 78. 10, and the fragmentary 1. 78 has two stanzas which belong with the funeral stanzas.

Of course no final statements about the Kashmirian Atharva Veda can be made now but certain tendencies may be noted. In Books 1-12 of Pāipp the hymns which appear in Pāipp but not in Ś are to those which appear in both about as four to three; this ratio may not hold for the entire collection but I suspect that it

will not be greatly changed. In Whitney's Atharva-Veda Lanman quotes Roth *Atti del iv Congresso internazionale degli Orientalisti,* ii 95, to this effect: "The Kashmirian text is more rich in Brāhmaṇa passages and in charms and incantations than is the Vulgate." The review made in this paper gives no cause for modification of that statement: counter charms (class 3), love charms (class 4) and hymns for ritualistic use (class 11) are frequent, and Pāipp contributes a goodly number of new hymns in these classes.

The RV hymns in Pāipp enlarge class 11: about forty RV hymns are used in AVŚ, and an additional number of RV stanzas most of which are in Book 7 of Ś where often a single stanza is counted as a hymn. In Books 1-6 of Ś four-fifths of the RV material occurs in RV 10 which is noted for its Atharvan flavor; all but two of these hymns of Ś appear also in Pāipp. In Book 7 of Ś there are about thirty RV stanzas of which only four are in RV 10, and about one-half of these thirty stanzas are also in Pāipp: in Books 8-19 of Ś there is a good amount of RV material, particularly in Ś 14 and 18 with material from RV 10 predominating, and excepting the funeral hymns the Pāipp also has this material. It seems then that the hymns which appear in Ś and RV almost all appear also in Pāipp. But Pāipp in Books 1-12 shares with RV ten hymns which neither Ś nor other texts have; it has four others which occur in RV and Yajur-Veda texts but not in Ś; and I have noted in Pāipp 13 two RV hymns which do not appear in Ś, both very distinctive hymns to Indra (RV 1. 32 and 2. 12). It seems probable that Pāipp and Ś contain each about the same proportion of material which appears in the RV collection as we know it, but that the Pāipp redactors ranged a little more thoroughly through that material and took into the Pāipp collection some hymns that have less distinctive Atharvan tone than do those that were taken into the AVŚ collection; this may indicate that the Pāippalādins had somewhat more sympathy if not more familiarity with RV material than did the Śāunakīyas.

SOME NOTES ON EARLY CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

F. GAVIN
GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK

(A) *The Terminology of Christian Baptism.*

ONE OF THE PHENOMENA which arouse considerable interest from the standpoint of Christian archeology, and present problems of some difficulty from the standpoint of Christian doctrine, is concerned with the nomenclature employed in relation to Christian Baptism. In Hebrew the verb for baptism is *ṭabal,* in Syriac *'amad,* and in Greek *baptizein.* The question of the change from the Hebrew root *ṭabal* to an entirely different one in the cognate Syriac language is a matter of great interest. With a terminology for baptism probably already in existence, and usages ready to hand, why did not Syriac utilize the current Hebrew idiom?

A brief resumé of the state of the question may not be beside the point. James Murdock in an article called "The Syriac Word for Baptism" in *Bibliotheca Sacra,* 7 (1850), pp. 733-743, interpreted the Syriac *'amad,* meaning *the reception of baptism,* as "coming to a stand" or "taking a public and decisive stand on the side of Christianity" (p. 740). In the same publication, of the next year (8, pp. 554-563) Davies in his article "An Investigation in Syriac Philology" presented a number of different opinions as to the meaning of the word. There is, first of all, that advanced by Murdock (noted above), which was first proposed by Michaelis and approved by Gesenius: *to take a decisive stand.* A second view, proposed by Henderson and Schindler in the *Lexicon Pentaglotton,* interpreted *'amad:* "to stand at or in water in order to be sprinkled or poured upon." "Stabant enim, qui baptizabantur." In other words, *'amad* meant to stand in the act of being baptized. Davies' criticism of this is pertinent: (a) Christians certainly stood up for other acts than baptism, and (b) what possible reference could this derivation bear in relation to the baptism of infants? (Cf. *op. cit.,* p. 555.) A third possibility was advanced by Dr. Augusti, Dr. Lee of Cambridge, and Moses Stewart. According to this, the root meaning of baptism came from the Sacrament of Confirmation; so *to stand = to establish = to con-*

firm. Davies' criticism is: (a) the rite of Confirmation is not as early as Apostolic days, according to his view, and (b) it is not necessarily conjoined immediately with baptism. Furthermore, in order to make this derivation, the *Aphel* of the verb would have to be employed to make the meaning clear, and, if the *Aphel* were used to suggest the ministering of baptism, we should expect a passive form (אתתעמד) *to be confirmed, to* express the receiving of baptism (*op. cit.,* p. 555). He points out that in the Peshitto Old and New Testaments the noun is often used with reference neither to the meaning *stand,* nor to Christian baptism (*e. g.,* Heb. 9 : 10; Mark 7 : 4, 8; John 5 : 2, 4, 7, and 9 : 7; Judith 12 : 7; Susannah 13 : 15). He also adduces some interesting examples from the Nestorian Ritual of Yeshuyab Adiabenus (Assemani, pp. 113, 140). The priest says: "*N.* is baptized (עמד פלן) in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost"; "he dips him into the water" (מטבע לה במיא) and "causes him to ascend" (מסק לה מן מיא) (Assemani iv. [or part 2 of iii], page 243). He also quotes from a Syriac Ritual of 1572 (*Liber Rituum Severi Patriarchae,* published at Antwerp), p. 26: "the Son bowed his head and was baptized" (ארכן רישה ועמד). In the Invocation (p. 36) in this same passage there are the words: "Thou . . . who dippedst thy head into the water (צבעת במיא) . . . we invoke, . . . who by thy holy baptism openedst Heaven which was before closed on account of our sins" (Davies, *op. cit.,* p. 558). Despite, then, the presence of the words in the Syriac meaning *to dip* or *to bow* (*ṭab'a, ṣab'a*), the Syriac writers seem to prefer an entirely different root. Following the suggestion of Augusti, *Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie,* ii, p. 311, both Davies (*op. cit.,* p. 563) and Wright seem to feel that a negative reason establishing the Syriac preference for other words than *ṭab'a* and *ṣab'a* is to be attributed to their repugnance towards using terminology associated with the heretical sect of the Sabeans or Hemerobaptists (*Ṣebâ'în*).

Dr. Wright ("On the Syriac term *'amad,"* in *Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record,* 1859, third series, January, volume viii, pp. 405-407) shows how the two *'ayins* in Arabic are transliterated in cognate Semitic languages by using the only *'ayin* that these kindred tongues possess. He points out that it is totally impossible to interpret the Syriac term for baptism by the meaning

"standing" (*op. cit.*, p. 407; and cf. in same volume p. 231). He derives the Syriac *'amad* from the cognate Arabic roots *ġamada* (*to sheath* the sword) or *ġamata* (*to immerse*). The Syriac term, meaning "dipped" or "immersed," is used in Numbers 31: 23. This usage is also clear from 2 Kings 5: 14, as is pointed out in the *Thesaurus* (volume ii, cols. 2906 ff.). As illustrating this use, cf. an excerpt from Bar Hebraeus, *Chron.*, iii. ii, 243 (*in aquam immerget dicens, Baptizatur,* etc.): מטבע לה במיא ואמר עמר. The lexicon of Bar-Ali and Bar Bahlul bear out this etymology.

In the light of convergent testimony it may be rash to offer any tentative alternatives to these explanations. But it does undoubtedly seem extraordinary that the Hebrew root *'amad* should appear in Syriac only as a noun meaning *column, tribunal,* "locus elatus" (2 Kings 11: 14; 23: 3; Sirach 24: 4; Judith 13: 6, etc.). Why was the Hebrew root *'amad* used solely in this one meaning, consonant with the normal Hebrew usage, and yet attached to a totally different meaning (baptism), for which no Hebrew authority is adducible? Why, it might also be asked, is the Hebrew root used in connection with baptize and baptism (*ṭabal*) so completely discarded?

With great hesitation, two suggestions might here be advanced. By a comparison of Sirach 24. 4: ἐν στύλῳ νεφέλης given in Syriac as בעמודי ענגא, with 1 Cor. 10: 2, more than merely an association of ideas may be seen in the Pauline text (cf. A. J. Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism,* 1891, pp. 40-42). The reference to "baptism in the cloud and in the sea" might easily, in the minds of Syriac speaking and thinking Christians, elicit the reference here to the Syriac term for "pillar of cloud." The association with one of the types of baptism in the Old Testament, already familiar to Syriac Christians in the language of the Peshitto, might account for this figurative use of the word now to be allocated permanently to the Christian Rite.

A second alternative suggestion, very tentatively propounded, would look for the origin of the Syriac usage of *'amad* as a substitution for the Hebrew root *ṭabal,* in the Rabbinic use of a derivative of *'amad,* namely *ma'amad.*[1] This question touches upon and involves a much larger question, which it is not my present purpose

[1] The Syriac term for baptism is מעמודיתא.

here to discuss, namely, the relation between Jewish proselyte baptism and primitive Christian baptism with reference to the *agent* and *witnesses.* Rabbinic custom demanded adequate witnesses for the baptism of a proselyte, as we know from *Yeb.* 47b, etc. So much was this the case that no one could make himself a proselyte of Judaism validly, apart from the presence of proper witnesses. In several places in Rabbinic literature *bema'amad* means "in the presence of," as for example *Baba Bathra* 144a. Rabh said ". . . give it to so and so in the presence of the three of them" (במעמד שלשתן). Other similar passages may be found in *Jer. Sheb.* vi: 37a; *Jer. Git.* ix: 50c; *Jer. Keth.* xiii: 36a, etc. Might it not be possible that the Syriac term derives from this kindred Rabbinic usage? If the significant thing in a valid proselyte's baptism were that the baptism should take place *in the presence of* duly qualified witnesses, then might not the term which is used in other connections to suggest the *presence of witnesses* have become so significantly attached to the Rite as in Syriac usage to have been transferred to stand for the whole Rite itself?

(B) *Did St. John the Baptist baptize by Aspersion?*

In Matt. 11: 7 ff. our Lord says to the crowds concerning John: "What went ye out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken with the wind? But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? behold, they that wear soft clothing are in kings' houses. But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? yea, I say unto you and more than a prophet." (Cf. Matt. 7: 24 ff.) It is somewhat difficult to make clear the reference to the "reed shaken by the wind." Strack (*ad loc., Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch,* pp. 596-7) gives us only a passage from *Ta'an.* 20a and one from *Baba Bathra* 12a, neither of which seem to have an intimate bearing on the explanation, save perhaps the latter. The question may be asked, Did the Baptist baptize by effusion, using a reed of some sort as a "sprinkler" (aspersorium)? In this connection it might be well to compare Psalm 51, 9: "Thou shalt wash me with hyssop and I shall be clean; thou shalt cleanse me and I shall be whiter than snow." The cleansing with hyssop (Hebrew *ezov*) is strictly enjoined in several places in the Old Testament, such as Lev. 14: 4, 6, 49, 51;

Num. 19: 18; Ex. 12: 22. The cleansing by aspersion was a regular part of the Jewish ceremonial lustration, commanded by the Law. Did St. John the Baptist make a free application of the rite in his "baptism of repentance"? The hyssop and its ritual use is spoken of in Mishna *Parah* xi and xii. In Parah xi: 8 it is spoken of as a "wood." In Parah xii: 1 there appears the interesting phrase "baptism with *ezov*" (*ṭevilah be'ezov*). If in this passage the technical word for baptism can be so used, it would suggest that the word had come to have an extended meaning, not limited to the normal and ordinary usage of "dipping," or "immersion." So far as concerns the application of the Greek word *kalamos* to the word for hyssop, we may say: (a) the word "reed" might be used, figuratively for hyssop, as if by a hyperbolic reference to sprinkling of water upon the baptizand with the hyssop or some such plant (just exactly what the "hyssop" was it is difficult to ascertain); (b) or by an extension of the meaning of the word *ezov*—*e. g.*, the usage in Suk. 13a (where it is regarded as one of the reeds or branches which might allowably be used for the making of the booth)—hyssop might be regarded as a reed.

This tentative suggestion finds a limited confirmation in one puzzling instance of early Christian pictorial art. In the cemetery of Praetestatus "There is a fresco, dating from the end of the second century, the meaning of which has been much disputed. It represents three beardless figures, clothed in tunic and toga, but with bare feet. That on the right stands with the head slightly turned to the left; the two figures on the left hold long cane-stalks with leaves in their hands; that in the hand of the central figure touches the head of the figure to the right, round whose head are short stalks of cane. To the extreme right is a growing cane on the bend of which is a dove" (C. F. Rogers, "Baptism and Christian Archeology," in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica,* Oxford, 1903, volume v, part iv, pp. 245-246). Rogers notes that Garrucci, after first explaining it as a scene of the passion, concludes that it represents our Lord's baptism. He gives other views, *op. cit.*, page 247. He himself regards it as referring to our Lord's baptism, and says: "The marks round the head, usually explained as representing the crown of thorns, have a parallel in the indications of water in the fresco of the cemetery of St. Callistus" (cf. example 3, page 243).

The following excerpt from Brandt, *Die jüdischen Baptismen*

(Giessen, 1910, p. 79), is of interest in this connection: "In dem mandäischen Traktat von Johanna's Ausgang (im rechten Genza pag. 191 der Petermann'schen Edition) antwortet Johannes auf eine Frage nach seiner Taufe: 'Ich werfe die Menschen in den Jordan, wie Schafe vor den Hirten, und Wasser mache ich mit meinem Stabe über sie fliessen, und den Namen des Lebens nenne ich über ihnen.'"

(C) *The Agent in early Christian Baptism.*

(The notes following constitute an abstract of a larger essay which attempts to deal more fully with the various questions involved.)

In any study concerning the rise of Christian institutions the sources are to be found in archeology, comparative philology, liturgical texts, and the course of the development of Christian thought as a whole. Assuming an intimate kinship between the טבילת גרות and the Christian rite of Baptism, the student is immediately aware of one fundamental difference: the apparent necessity of the *agent* or *minister* of Christian Baptism, who must be a person other than the baptizand. Mature Jewish procedure can be found in compendious form in the *Shulḥan Aruch* (*Yore Dea* 268-270; Vilna ed., 1911, II. pp. 661-665), the cumulative content of which embraces many centuries' usage. The most cursory acquaintance with the Rabbinic material amply demonstrates the fact (attested philologically by the meaning of the root טבל) that proselyte baptism was self-administered.

Brandt (*Die jüdischen Baptismen, oder das religiöse Waschen und Baden im Judentum mit Einschluss des Judenchristentums,* Giessen, 1910) called attention to this fact (*e. g.*, p. 78) in a rather incidental way. Merx (*Die vier kanonischen Evangelien,* II.) dealt with the lexical questions concerning *βαπτίζειν* and the hiphil of טבל (p. 41, n. 1, *et al.*). Easton ('Self-Baptism,' in *A. J. Th.*, 24, pp. 513-518) advances important textual considerations, and draws attention to the significance of the question. His statement that "the change in the conception of the minister of baptism was inevitable as part of the change of Christianity from Jewish to Christian soil" (*ibid.*, p. 518) is capable of fuller substantiation from the study of the development of early Christian belief and practice in regard to baptism.

Certain tentative conclusions may be presented in epitome in the following propositions:

(1) The earliest written Christian tradition may be found as a whole in the following passages: 1 Cor. 6: 11; 12: 12-14; Rom. 6: 3; Gal. 3: 27; Tit. 3: 5; Heb. 6: 1 ff.; (cf. 10: 22, 9: 13); Acts 2: 38-39; 8: 14-17; 10: 47; 18: 24-19: 8; John 3: 3 ff.; 1 Jn. 2: 27; 7: 37, &c.

(2) Explicitly or implicitly this body of tradition includes the following elements: Baptism is (a) a washing away of sins (sin considered as a defilement), (b) the initiatory rite of entrance into a new fellowship, (c) with an eschatological reference, and (d) the means of regeneration by virtue of the gift of the Spirit.

(3) All of these elements are present in subsequent Christian tradition: *e. g., Didache, passim; Barnabas* 11. 11; *Shepherd, Sim.* 9, 16, 31; Tertullian, *De baptismo,* 3 *et al.*; Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolycum,* 2, 16; St. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.,* 3, 17, 2; Clem. Alex., *Paed.* 1, 6; 25, 3; Origen, *Hom. in Num.,* 7, 2, *Hom. in Lev.,* 2, 4; Cyprian, *Ad Donatum,* 4; St. Methodius, *Convivium decem virginum,* 8, 8; Aphraates, *Hom.* 6, 14; Cyril Jer., *Cat.,* 3, 12; Basil, *Homil. in bap.,* 13, &c.

(4) These elements may be reduced, for practical purposes, to two: (a) the washing away of sins, and (b) the regeneration through the Spirit, of which the former is separable from the latter, but both are present together in our earliest redaction of the tradition to writing.

(5) While for the washing away of the defilement of sin no agent or minister might be necessary, there is ample justification for maintaining that an agent, other than the candidate or baptizand himself, is demanded for that aspect of the rite in which the Spirit is imparted.

(a) The account in Acts, as Stromberg, *Studien zur Theorie und Praxis der Taufe in der christlichen Kirche der ersten zwei Jahrhunderte,* Berlin, 1913, points out (cf. pp. 133-140), takes for granted the intimate bond between baptism and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

(b) Patristic tradition confirms this essential relationship. In the words of Primasius of Arles (550): *Donum Spiritus Sancti quod datur in baptismate per impositionem manus episcoporum* there is phrased the consolidation of the tradition in its accepted

form. (On the cognate questions, cf. Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism,* New York, 1891.)

(c) The study of the liturgical tradition gives still more complete confirmation of fundamental union between these two phases of the function and fruits of baptism.

(d) On the basis of its later development the early Christian tradition is made intelligible and its rationale, theologically and liturgically, explicable.

THE LEGEND OF KOSTRYUK

CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

NO EPISODE connected with Ivan the Terrible has been more exploited by the unknown composers of the historical songs of Russia than the marriage of Ivan to Marya Temryukovna and the fight between her brother Kostryuk-Mastryuk and a Russian champion. In the latest collection of these songs published by V. Th. Miller ("Historical Songs of the Russian People of the XVI and XVIIth centuries," *Istoricheskiya Pyesni Russkago Naroda* XVI i XVII vv., Vol. XCIII, Sbornik otdyeleniya russkago yazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoy akademii nauk, Petrograd, 1915), there are included 65 versions of this legend covering 210 pages as against 43 versions and 200 pages of the next largest group, Ivan the Terrible and his Sons. Versions of this second story have been gathered in 11 governments whereas the legend of Temryuk has been found in 22.

The story is relatively simple. After the death of his wife Anastasia, Ivan marries a foreign princess Marya Temryukovna with whom he receives a large dowry. Her brother, Kostryuk-Mastryuk, visits Ivan and challenges the Russians to find a champion to meet him in a fight. Through Nikita Romanovich Ivan secures a champion for Russia. Kostryuk despite his boasting is decisively defeated and as a final insult is stripped naked and driven out to the amusement of the populace. The tsar is rather amused than insulted at this mishap to his brother-in-law and refuses to do other than reward the victor.

The historical basis for the song can be ascertained with some degree of accuracy, but this helps us rather to identify the actors than the incident in which they figure. Within a week after the death of Anastasia, Ivan planned to marry the sister of the king of Poland-Lithuania. In fact, if we may believe the anonymous poet, Anastasia knew of this intention (No. 27, l. 51), but this we may well doubt. The plan failed and the next year, 1562, the tsar married a daughter of a Circassian prince Temryuk. The girl was baptized under the name of Marya and died without children in 1569. The chroniclers tell us little of her character, but she

does not seem to have won the love of the people. One of her brothers, Michael, came to Moscow before the wedding in 1568 and served at court until he was accused of treason and impaled by Ivan in 1571. During these years he was the butt of Ivan and the court. The tsar never failed to insult him and mock him in every way and to submit him to all possible indignities. In 1565 another brother Mastryuk visited Ivan at the Aleksandrova Sloboda and seems to have won the fancy of that whimsical and fickle ruler. The tsar sent back an army to help him and his father against the Turks and built a city on the Terek River to assist his wife's people. Still later when Mastryuk was captured by the khan Devlet Girey, Ivan tried to ransom him and years later we find Mastryuk as the firm friend of Russia.

We have no record of any fight in which either Michael or Mastryuk participated, although there may very well be some basis for the whole story. Keltuyala (*Kurs russkoy literatury,* Vol. I, Part 2, p. 709) remarks that in this story poetic creation has the mastery over historical facts. V. Sokolov (*Shurin Groznago, udaloy borets Mastryuk Temgryukovich;* "The brother-in-law of the Terrible, the bold fighter Mastryuk Temgryukovich": *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosvyeshcheniya,* Vol. 46, p. 20) endeavors to prove on the basis of such passages as No. 77, l. 72[1] that the original scene of the fight was not at Moscow but at the Aleksandrova Sloboda and therefore can be dated during the visit of Mastryuk in 1565. He therefore definitely connects Kostryuk with Mastryuk and not with the despised brother Michael.

S. K. Shambinago (*Pyesni-pamflety XVI vyeka,* "Pamphlet songs of the XVIth century") as quoted by Sokolov (*op. cit.*) and V. Th. Miller (*O nyekotorykh pyesennikh otgoloskakh sobytiy tsarstvovaniya Ivana Groznago,* "Concerning some echoes in songs of the events in the reign of Ivan the Terrible." *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosvyeshcheniya,* Vol. 46, p. 1 ff.) pays a great deal of attention to this story and endeavors to prove that it is an attack on the marriage of the tsar to the Circassian princess. He also argues that in the Russian champion we have a reflection of Michael Vorotynsky who defeated the khan Devlet Girey in 1572

[1] They were from the Nizova side, residents of the merry city, the Aleksandrova Sloboda.

and was soon after executed for treason by the suspicious Ivan. Shambinago argues that some of the songs such as No. 51 result from a contamination of the song of the king's wedding and another song on the unsuccessful raid of Devlet in 1572 in both of which songs a single combat was a prominent episode. Both Sokolov and Miller reject this contamination. Miller goes further and shows how the influence of Vorotynsky can be found in some of the other songs such as Ivan at Serpukhov (No. 93-95) but not here, and he emphasizes the fact that the champion is rarely called Mishenka as Shambinago supposes.

The publication of the collection of historical songs by Miller in 1915 has rendered available a much larger number of versions, some of which give us striking details which do not seem to have been regarded by Shambinago or even Miller and Sokolov. It may therefore be of interest to consider these songs again and to try to classify them.

When we try to arrange these songs in groups we are hampered by the fact that the details of the different versions vary widely according to the will and memory of the bard, but we can distinguish certain similarities among versions which come from identical or adjoining governments. There are three governments which have given us a relatively large number of songs, Archangel, Olonets, and Simbirsk; and the songs from Novgorod and Vologda may be added to the Olonets group. The three songs from Kaluga (No. 88-90) also form a small group which agree in the death of Kostryuk in the fight. In No. 90 his sister, the tsaritsa, recognizes the other version by saying: You should not have beaten him against mother-earth, you should have taken off his green tunic and his morocco boots and let him go wholly naked" (75-8). The songs from the other provinces are scattered in number and need hardly be mentioned except No. 58 from Petersburg, in which it is Ivan's daughter who marries Kostryuk and the rôles are entirely confused.

The Simbirsk group (No.72-80) is the simplest of the three larger groups. The songs are usually short. Kostryuk issues the challenge and two brothers appear. These two brothers are not clearly defined and in these as in other songs it is often hard to decide whether Kostryuk fights one of the brothers, both of them in succession, or both simultaneously. As Kostryuk accepts the

challenge, he jumps up from his place at the table and by his impetuosity he overturns the entire room and destroys 30 Tatars, 150 boyars and 700 Don Cossacks (No. 78, l. 48-9). The numbers vary but there is always this great onslaught. Then Kostryuk is easily beaten and stripped. The tsaritsa abuses the victor in most indecent language and Ivan remarks that he is glad to see the Tatar discomfited because it pleases the Russians. Yet the tradition here is undoubtedly confused. There is nothing in the story to lead us to expect Kostryuk's thunderous departure from the banqueting hall which is strangely out of place. Three of the group are hopelessly confused. Thus in No. 74 the fight is between the two brothers, the elder defending Russia, the younger attacking her. In No. 75 Temruk Temrukovich, Mastryuk Mastryukovich is the Russian champion against Temryugalov. In No. 76 the ending is entirely lacking. It is this group in particular which Shambinago seems to use and he cites such versions as No. 74 to emphasize the position of the two brothers. This seems very weak.

The Olonets group is very different. With this we must place No. 50-57 and 59 and also No. 60-62 from Novgorod and Vologda. In this group the marriage of the tsar is almost entirely forgotten and Kostryuk instead of being the tsar's brother-in-law is the son or lover of the Krim tsaritsa. He comes with his pagan train to Russia with the intention of securing a champion or of conquering Russia. Ivan succeeds in finding a champion to meet the young boaster who says that he has taken seventy cities without meeting defeat. Kostryuk is defeated and apparently killed. In some versions such as 56 the Krim tsaritsa is taken prisoner and is not allowed to return to her own land. In others she is allowed to escape but departs with sorrow, leaving Kostryuk dead. Shambinago rests particularly upon this group in his endeavor to prove contamination and he tries to explain why Kostryuk, the friend of Russia, suddenly becomes its foe. It is assumed that as a prisoner of Devlet Girey he was compelled to take part in the raid of 1571 when the horde suceeded in burning Moscow.

The third group from Archangel presents the most striking peculiarities and figures the least in the discussions of the theme which we have mentioned. This embraces No. 27-43 and also No. 44-49 from Olonets. The story differs radically. In many

of this group Marya is not a Circassian but a Lithuanian. There are often details given of the wooing as well as of the wedding. Then Kostryuk issues the challenge; it is accepted. Kostryuk runs out, fights, and is defeated. He is stripped naked and takes refuge beneath the porch of the palace and then flees home from Russia with the statement that he will never return. Another point which is of suprising character in these songs is the discovery that Kostryuk is really a girl (27, 29, 35, 36, 40, 46, 49, 50, 55, 59, 47.) These songs in their description of the humiliation of Kostryuk are very frequently frank to the point of indecency and the discovery of the woman disguised as a man does not improve the modesty of the songs. Finally as regards the opponent of Kostryuk, we may remark that he is often regarded as lame and that the confusion of the functions of the two brothers is not so marked. Thus in 35 and 36 we have three brothers, Mishenka, Grishenka and Vasenka. The two elder brothers look Kostryuk over and decide that they will not fight him and thus automatically the youngest brother is called upon to undertake the task of vindicating the power of Russia.

In many ways this group must be taken as containing the original form of the story. Thus the beginnings of the different songs, such as No. 27, fit into the general frame of the epic account of the reign of Ivan. We have the motif of the death of the former wife and the negotiations that lead to the second marriage. The conclusions are more satisfactory. The songs lack the rather obvious retort of Ivan that he does not care for the discomfiture of the Tatar provided the Russian is amused and gives us some more epic accounts. Thus in No. 27 and 41 Marya pays the penalty with her life and Ivan marries again in stone Moscow in Holy Russia (No. 27). In No. 30 the tsar does try to save the feelings of his brother-in-law by saying that the humiliation was ordered by Nikita Romanovich but Kostryuk wisely remarks: God grant I may not be here again, not only I but my children (ll. 172-3). (Cf. 31, 35, 36, 43, 44, 47.) Kostryuk runs home weeping to his parents with the same remark (No. 33). Finally it is to be noted that these songs do not show the great defeat of the guests when Kostryuk dashes out. Instead of upturning all the tables and destroying hundreds of guests, both of his own retainers and the Russians, Kostryuk merely hits his foot against

the table (No. 30, l. 105). The few instances where there may be a sign of this overthrow, as No. 37 and 38, are not among those songs which fit best into the general epic account of the action viewed as part of the reign of Ivan. In fact on every test that can be applied, we may fairly hold that we have in these Archangel songs the best and most natural account of the duel between Kostryuk and a Russian. We find in these songs the greatest variety of invention and also the greatest realism and energy. There is less of the schematic and formal about them and we may well believe that the more southern versions are mutilated versions of these northern songs.

This assumption of the superiority of the northern versions is not a necessary circumstance. Thus in the Yermak songs the Siberian song preserved by Kirsha Danilov (Miller, *op. cit.* No. 159) gives us far and away the best and most complete account of the expedition to Siberia as well as of the circumstances which preceded. This is however to be expected, for Yermak is the Siberian hero and it is natural that his reputation should be more highly regarded there than elsewhere.

If we are to assume that the Archangel group gives us substantially the best account of Ivan and Kostryuk, we may ask next whether the byliny of the north have exerted any influence upon the story. Our answer to this must be unqualifiedly in the affirmative. In fact we may say that the entire framework for the legend of Ivan and Marya is identical with that for the wooing of Vladimir and Apraxia.

There is the same wavering between Lithuania and the Horde as the home of the bride. Magnus (*The Heroic Ballads of Russia,* p. 30) mentions the home of the girl as Lithuania but Kirsha Danilov (*Drevniya rossiyskiya stikhotvoreniya,*[3] p. 58 ff.) frankly locates the scene in the Golden Horde. Vladimir does not go in person on his wooing but Ivan does. However in one song (No. 33) Ivan is accompanied on his journey by Dunayushka Ivanovich, the very same bogatyr whom Vladimir sends off to Lithuania on the same errand. Even though the story dispenses with the marvellous, no bard would introduce the name of one of the heroes of the older cycle as Dunay Ivanovich without invoking memories of this older tale.

Perhaps it is to this same bylina influence that we owe the

appearance of Kostryuk as a girl. When Dunay Ivanovich and Dobrynya Nikitich were returning home with Apraxia, they were overtaken by a hero who engaged Dunay in fight. Long and severe was the struggle but finally the Russian triumphed. "Dunay sat upon his foe's white breast, and would have pierced it, but his tender heart was terrified, and his arm stiffened at the shoulder; for the bosom was that of a woman (Hapgood, *Epic Songs of Russia,*[2] p. 35). This woman turns out to be the heroic sister of Apraxia, the wife of Dunay, Nastasya, and returns with him to Kiev where she receives baptism. If we could assume this parallel between the bylina and the song, it would be easy to assume that the sex of Kostryuk was affected by the same circumstance. This appearance of Nastasya and the exploits of Vasilisa Mikulichna, the wife of Stavr Godinovich (Cf. Magnus, *op. cit.* p. 100) are the chief instances of the disguised woman in heroic Russian poetry. It will be at once noted that in both cases the subject is treated with far greater delicacy than here but this may be merely a sign of the superior qualities of the byliny which took their rise before the degrading yoke of Tatar supremacy was fastened upon the country.

There is however another possible interpretation. In many cases in the epic songs we find the Krym tsaritsa called "polenitsa" (No. 52, l. 5). Everywhere in the songs the polenitsa describes the Amazon, the woman who is a match for the boldest warriors. The same usage exists in the byliny. Thus Ilya of Murom meets in battle a vigorous woman, a polyanitsa whom he recognizes as his daughter and whose treachery forces him to slay her (Magnus, *op. cit.* p. 42). It will be noted that here again the woman is from Lithuania, the same home where the woman Kostryuk usually lives. On the other hand in the written literature of this period, polyanitsa is used as a masculine to denote a bold hero, one who rides over the open field and it is in this sense that the word is used in the Zadonshchina of the late fourteenth century describing the victory of Dimitry Donskoy at Kulikovo (Cf. I. I. Sreznevsky, *Materialy dlya slovarya drevne-russkago yazyka,* Vol. II, p. 1153). It is very likely that the confusion between the popular feminine and the literary masculine meaning of this term may have assisted in turning the wandering hero Kostryuk into the dread woman who is met and defeated.

The disfavor which Marya Temryukovna won in Russia is perhaps also due to the same form of confusion. Thus in the byliny we have the venomous and evil character of Marya the White Swan (Cf. the ballads of Dobrynya Nikitich and Ivan Godinovich). She certainly embodies features of the Polish girl, Marina Mniszek, the wife of the False Dimitry. With Marya Temryukovna a foreigner preceding the second Marina and confused with a mythical figure that was well-known, there is small wonder that the bards speak of her as a savage serpent (No. 29, l. 17). This evil tradition, seen also in No. 28 where Marya is a sorceress giving to her stepchildren a poisoned cloak so as to destroy them, was gained very early. Karamzin in his History repeats it and we may take it as the general opinion which Marya left in Russia but unfortunately we cannot tell whether she was wicked or whether she was merged in fable with her supernatural and later sisters. The direct evidence of her personality is too scanty to allow us to answer this question with any probability but we may assume that Ivan's kindness to her brother Mastryuk would not have survived any suspicious actions on the part of the wife Marya.

When we pass from the leading characters to the Russian champion, we find other parellels to the byliny. Thus in No. 36 Vasenka refuses to fight because he is sick. Three times does Ivan give him a huge cup of wine before he declares himself in condition to meet the foe. This passage

> Da ya toperya co tsareva kabaka,
> Da bolit buyna golova,
> Da shipit retivo ser'tse (ll.123-5)

is strikingly like a passage from the bylina of Vasily the Drunkard, who in a similar situation says:

> A ne mogu stat' da golovy pod'nyat'
> A bolit da u Vas'ka buyna golova,
> A noyet-shipit u mnya retivo ser'tse
> (A. D. Grigoryev, *Arkhangelskiya byliny i istoricheskiya pyesni,* Vol. II, no. 339, ll. 133-5).

The motif of the absence of all the heroes from Moscow is very similar to that of the bogatyrs who are away from Kiev when

Tsar Batyg attacks (cf. Hapgood, *op. cit.* p. 132 ff). Song No. 49 ends with the message of Ivan to the three brothers,

"Come to me to the stone house, I will give you twenty-five rubles apiece in money and I will give you a letter of approval, to travel around other cities and fairs, to trade forever in different wares without duty and without tax and without imperial payment and to drink wine in every kabak without price" (ll. 124-103).

This permission is greatly desired by Ilya of Murom in the bylina Ilya in disguise (Hapgood, *op. cit.* p. 79 ff.) and we may say that it is characteristic of all the peasant champions who appear in Holy Russia.

Although we can parallel so strikingly the byliny and these songs from Archangel, the authors of the latter have kept a firmer hold on historical and physical possibility than in some of the other groups. Thus in one of the songs from Olonets, Mishka took Kostryuk below himself, raised him above his shoulder higher than the buildings of the churches and the pious crosses, to the Holy Michael and the Levanidov cross, and then threw him down against mother earth (No. 53, ll. 105 ff., cf. also No. 56, etc.). In one of the Simbirsk group (No. 80) Kostryuk hisses like a serpent and roars like a beast (ll. 75-6). The expression used is the one familiar from the description of Nightingale the Robber and of all the wonderful beasts against which the heroes of Holy Russia fight.

Because of this close relationship between this song and the byliny, we can easily understand the origin of the Olonets form. As soon as the marriage of Ivan and Marya was confused in the minds of the singers and its role confused, the relationship between the Circassian tsaritsa and her brother and Russia was regarded as unnatural and the people began to think of some of the other Asiatics and giants who invaded Russia and engaged in combat with the Russian bogatyrs. Idolische, Tugarin the Serpent's Son, Nightingale the Robber, the Polyanitsa, etc., all played a somewhat analogous role to Kostryuk and in different places have left some print upon his character. For this reason it does not seem necessary to postulate a different ballad as the basis for these legends or to assume that Kostryuk took active part in the campaign of 1571 while a prisoner of Devlet Girey. In the actual

byliny, Marya the White Swan was always punished at the end and once Marya Temryukovna was brought under her baleful influence it was only natural that she too should meet with an untimely end as in No. 27 where she is killed or in 83 from Moscow where she twittered like a magpie and flew away from stone Moscow.

This paper has not sought to mention all the differences between the songs. Many of these are very minute and represent little but the personal embellishments made by the singer himself. Others of them, as No. 28 where Marya appears as a sorceress trying to murder Ivan's children, are frankly unique and wander far from the general type of the story. We have tried to consider the general forms which the story takes and to see how these are related.

In general we may conclude that this legend has been far more influenced by the bylina tradition than most of the historical songs. The use of epic expressions is of course to be expected in all folk poetry and also the magnifying of the qualities of the heroes. In this case the bards have gone further. The marriage of Ivan and Marya seemed to them the same type of marriage as that of Vladimir and Apraxia. The arrival of the tsaritsa's brother at court seemed to them closely parallel to the coming of the foreign barbarians to Vladimir and on the basis of some episode, perhaps a fight or the participation in some kind of a contest, the singers set to work. Unconsciously they fashioned a story simple and perhaps at once rather indecent. Then as time passed and the actual events commemorated faded from memory, Marya Temryukovna, Marina Mniszek and Marya the White Swan were merged, and as the account of the struggle passed southward and eastward, the sequence of events became less important. Kostryuk was accepted as the champion of the East and became hostile to Russia. His overthrow became a national necessity and he was endowed with all kinds of superhuman attributes and often given a death in the struggle. The old sportiveness disappeared with the new conditions and the general tone of the episode changed. Ivan of course remained in it. So did Marya and Kostryuk but no longer with affection and sympathy. For this reason it is idle to wonder which brother of Marya is represented or to express

surprise that a woman who was the friend of Russia should appear as its enemy. We are dealing with a historical song because it deals with Ivan but the authors have freed themselves from history and in the last analysis have given us an interesting and original account of an imaginary fight between a friend and a foe of Holy Russia.

THE KASHMIRIAN ATHARVA VEDA, BOOK TWELVE EDITED WITH CRITICAL NOTES

LeRoy Carr Barret
Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut

Introduction

The twelfth book of the Pāippalāda herewith presented is only a little longer than the eleventh; it contains nothing of exceptional interest, though a little light is thrown on the text of some hymns which appear in Book 19 of Ś. The material is presented in the same manner as in previous books.

Of the ms.—This twelfth book in the Kashmir ms begins f141b7 and ends f144b10. This book begins with a hymn which is RV 1. 94; the first two pādas of st 1 are given on f141b and the rest of the hymn is on f154a and runs through line 5 of f154b: immediately after the two pādas of RV 1. 94. 1 our ms at f141b9 gives st 7 of the hymn which is Ś 19. 53 and continues on to the end of Ś 19. 54; but the first six stanzas of Ś 19. 53 are found f153b12 to f154a3 preceding the bulk of RV 1. 94. The obvious explanation would be that a folio of some predecessor of our manuscript was misplaced, but the position of part of the second hymn in book twelve ahead of the bulk of the first hymn makes the explanation not quite so simple: if we suppose that the folio was reversed when misplaced it does not seem that the result would be what we actually find. No satisfactory explanation of the situation has occurred to me, but I feel that the material given on f154 should be edited in this book and that has been done, as will be seen below.

The book covers in all about four folios. One line, f144a9 is badly broken, and there is a small defacement at the lower right corner of f154a.

Punctuation, numbers, etc.—The text is punctuated in the usual hap-hazard manner. Only one hymn is numbered, the numeral "5" standing at the end of the hymn I have numbered four; this might be considered an indication that our text counted the hymns which are Ś 19. 53 and 54 as separate hymns, but there is no indication of a division after st 10 of our hymn 2 in f141b14; there is a blank space for a numeral at the end of our second hymn. In

no. 5 the stanzas are numbered regularly, in no. 6 the first four are numbered, in no. 7 stanzas 2 and 6 are numbered. There is no grouping of the hymns in anuvākas. Corrections are few, either marginal or interlinear. Accents appear only on the last stanza of the first hymn.

Extent of the book.—This book has seven hymns as edited, the last one being prose. If there is a stanza norm it is probably sixteen. The following table shows the number of stanzas:

1	hymn	has	5	stanzas =	5 stanzas
1	"	"	10	" =	10 "
2	hymns	have	14	" =	28 "
3	"	"	16	" =	48 "
7	hymns	have			91 stanzas

New and old material.—The first hymn of this book is RV 1. 94, the second is Ś 19. 53 and 54, the fourth Ś 19. 32, the fifth Ś 19. 33: in the sixth there are a few bits of familiar material. The amount of new material may fairly be said to be 43 stanzas.

ATHARVA-VEDA PĀIPPALĀDA-ŚĀKHĀ
BOOK TWELVE

1
(RV 1. 94)

[f141b7] *atha dvādaśomārkāṇḍa atharvaṇadhyāyaṁ likhyate zz oṁ namo nārāyaṇā-* [8] *ya z z oṁ imaṁ stomam arhate jāta-bhavedase ratham iva san da-* [9] *hemāsanīkayāṣ (kāle)*

[f154a3] *bhadrā hi naṣ pramatir asya saṁ sam agne saṁkhye mā riṣāmā vayaṁ tava* | [4] *yasmāi tvam āhur bhajase sa ādity anarvān. kṣota tadate stuvīryaṁ sa bhūtāva nāi-* [5] *nam aśnoty aṅhatir agne z z bharāmedhmaṁ kṛṇavāmā havīṅṣi te jite a-* [6] *ntaṣ parvaṇā parvaṇā vayaṁ jīvātava prataraṁ mādhayā dayo gne z sasema tvaṁ* [7] *samidaṁ sādaye dhiyas te devā havir adanty āhutaṁ tvam ādityāṅ ā hava tādhyā-* [8] *kṣmasyāgne z tvam adhvaryur uta hotāsi pūrvyaḥ praśāstā potār januṣā purohitāḥ* [9] *viśvā vidvāṅ āhartvijyā dhīra puṣyasyāgneḥ z diśāṁ gopāsya jarantu janta-* [10] *vo dvipāś ca yad uta catuṣpad aktubhiḥ citraṣ praketasa uṣaso mahaṅ asyā-* [11] *gne* | *yo viśvatas supratīkas*

sadruhasi dūre diśchan talid ivāśi rocate | rā- [12] *rātnyāś ca tanvo ati deva paśyasyāgne | pūrve devā bhavatum uṣvato ratho smākaṁ śaṅ-* [13] *so anyastu dūḍhyaḥ tad ājānīto upuṣyatā vato gne z vadhūn duśaṅsāṅ̂ avi dū-* [14] *ḍhyo jahi dūre vā ye aṅti vā ke cid attriṇaḥ z adhā yajñāya śṛṇute* [15] *sugaṁ kṛṣy agne yad ukthān pārohito rathe vātajūtā ṛṣabhasyeva te ravaḥ z* [16] *yujinvasti vanino dhūmaketunāgne adha svanāḍ uta svidyuḥ patattriṇo dhrapsā* [17] *ya te yavasādo vy asthiran. suga tat te tāvakedyo rathebhyo gne z tvaṁ mittrasya varu-* [18] *ṇa dhayasya vayātāṁ marutaṁ helo adbhutaḥ mṛḍā su no bhūtv eṣāṁ manaṣ pu-* [19] *nar agne z deve devānām asi mittro adbhūto vasur vasūnām ami cā* * * * [20] *dhvare | śarman syāma tava saprathastame gne z tat te bhadraṁ yat samiddhas*e * * [f154b] *somāhuto rajase mṛḍayāttasaḥ dadāsi ratna draviṇaṁ ca dāśuṣe gnes sākhye* [2] *mā riṣāmā vayaṁ tava z asmāi tvaṁ sodraviṇe dadhāso nāgāssim adite sa-* [3] *rvatāta yaṁ bhadreṇa śavamā codayāsi prajāvantāu rādhasyā te syāma z sa* [4] *tvagne sāubhagatvasya vidvāṅ asmākam āyuṣ pra tireha deva | tán no mittró váru-* [5] *ṇo mámahantām aditis síndhuṣ pṛthivī́ utá dyāuḥ z*

The ms corrects in 154a12 to (ta)ndho, and in 154b1 to (°ta)maḥ.

For the introductory phrase and invocation read: atha dvādaśamaṣ kāṇḍa ātharvaṇādhyāye likhyate z z oṁ namo nārāyaṇāya z z

Read: imaṁ stomam arhate jātavedase ratham iva saṁ mahemā manīṣayā | bhadrā hi naṣ pramatir asya saṁsady agne sakhye mā riṣāmā vayaṁ tava z 1 z yasmāi tvam †āhur bhajase† sa sādhaty anarvā kṣeti dadhate suvīryam | sa tūtāva nāinam aśnoty aṅhatir agne ° ° z 2 z bharāmedhmaṁ kṛṇavāmā havīṁṣi te citayantaṣ parvaṇā-parvaṇā vayam | jīvātave prataraṁ sādhayā dhiyo 'gne ° ° z 3 z śakema tvāṁ samidhaṁ sādhayā dhiyas tve devā havir adanty āhutam | tvam ādityāṅ ā vaha tān hy uśmasy agne ° ° z 4 z tvam adhvaryur uta hotāsi pūrvyaḥ praśāstā potā januṣā purohitaḥ | viśvā vidvāṅ̂ ārtvijyā dhīra puṣyasy agne ° ° z 5 z viśāṁ gopā asya caranti jantavo dvipac ca yad uta catuṣpad aktubhiḥ | citraṣ praketa uṣaso mahāṅ̂ asy agne ° ° z 6 z yo viśvatas supratīkas sadṛṅ̃ asi dūre cit san talid ivāti rocase | rātryāś cid andho ati deva paśyasy agne ° ° z 7 z pūrvo devā bhavatu suṣvato ratho

'smākaṁ śaṁso abhy astu dūḍhyaḥ | tad ā jānītota puṣyatā vaco 'gne ° ° z 8 z vadhāir duḥśaṁsāṁ ava dūḍhyo jahi dūre vā ye anti vā ke cid atriṇaḥ | adhā yajñāya gṛṇate sugaṁ kṛdhy agne ° ° z 9 z yad ayukthā ṭnpā rohitā rathe vātajūtā ṛṣabhasyeva te ravaḥ | ād invasi vanino dhūmaketunāgne ° ° z 10 z adha svanād uta bibhyuḥ patatriṇo drapsā yat te yavasādo vy asthiran | sugaṁ tat te tāvakebhyo rathebhyo 'gne ° ° z 11 z tvaṁ mitrasya varuṇasya dhāyase 'vayātāṁ marutāṁ helo adbhutaḥ | mṛḍā su no bhūtv eṣāṁ manaṣ punar agne ° ° z 12 z devo devānām asi mitro adbhuto vasur vasūnām asi cārur adhvare | śarman syāma tava saprathastame 'gne ° ° z 13 z tat te bhadraṁ yat samiddhas sve dame somāhuto rajase mṛḍayattamaḥ | dadhāsi ratnaṁ draviṇaṁ ca dāśuṣe 'gne sakhye mā riṣāmā vayaṁ tava z 14 z yasmāi tvaṁ sudraviṇo dadāśo 'nāgāstvam adite sarvatātā | yaṁ bhadreṇa śavasā codayāsi prajāvanto rādhasā te syāma z 15 z sa tvam agne sāubhagatvasya vidvāṁ asmākam āyuṣ pra tireha deva | tan no mitro varuṇo māmahantām aditis sindhuṣ pṛthivī uta dyāuḥ z 16 z 1 z

Possibly I have restored too frequently the RV readings, but there seem to be only a few minor variants here. In 2a RV has āyajase which perhaps is intended here. Stt 3 and 4 of RV are interchanged, also stt 5 and 6. In 8a suṣvato seems to be a real variant of RV sunvato. In 10a RV has ayukthā aruṣā and probably that should be the reading of Pāipp. In 12a RV has ayam. In 14b RV has jarase, which is probably the real reading.

2

(Ś 19. 53 and 54)

[f153b12] *kālo svo va-* [13] *hatus saptaraśmis sahasrākṣo akṣaro bhūriretāḥ | tam ā rohanti kavayo* [14] *vipaśyatas tasya cakrā bhuvanāni viśvā sapta cakrān vahatu kāla eṣaḥ* [15] *saptāsya nābhīr amṛtaṁ nv akṣaḥ z sā imā viśvā bhuvanāny aṅjaṁ kāla* [16] *sāiyyate prathamo nu devaḥ pūrṇaṣ kumbho adhi kālāhitas taṁ vāi paśyāmo bahu-* [17] *dhā ni santaṁ | sa imā viśvā bhuvanāni pratyaṁ kālaṁ tam āhuṣ parame vyo-* [18] *man. z sa yava saṁ bhuvanāny ābharat sa yava saṁ bhuvanāni parīyāiḥ pitā* [19] *saṁn abhavatu putra eṣāṁ tasmād vāi nānyat param astu tejaḥ kālo mūṁ diva* [f154a] *m ajanayat kālāimāṁ pṛthivīm uta kālena bhūtaṁ bhavyaṁ ca eṣataṁ ha vi tiṣṭhate | [2] kālo bhūtam asṛjat kālo tapatu sūryaḥ kāle viśvā bhūtāni kāle cakṣu-* [3] *r vi paśyati z*

[f141b9] *kālę manāṣ kāle praṇaṣ kāle nāma samāhi-* [10] *taṁ | kālena sarvā nandanty āgatena pradā imāḥ z kāle tapaṣ kāle jye-* [11] *ṣṭhaṁ kāle vrahma sasamāhitam. kālo ha sarvasyeśvaro yaṣ pitā-* [12] *sīt prajāpateḥ z teneṣitaṁ tena jātaṁ tad u tasmin pratiṣṭhitam. kālo* [13] *ha vrahma bhūtvā bibharti parameṣṭhinam. z kālaṣ prajā sṛjati kā-* [14] *lo gre prajāpatiṁ | svayambhūṣ kaśyapaṣ kālāt tataṣ kālād ajāyata | kā-* [15] *lād āpas sam abhavat kālād vrahma tapo diśaḥ kālenodayatu sūrya-* [16] *ṣ kālena viśate punaḥ kālena viśate punaṣ kālena vātaḥ pavate kā-* [17] *lena bhūtaṁ bhavyaṁ ca putro janayat puraḥ | kālād ṛjas sam abhavan yajuṣ kā-* [18] *lād ajāyata | kālo yajño sam īrayad devebhyo bhāgam akṣitaṁ | kāle* [f142a] *gandharvāpsarasaṣ kāle lokas samāhitāṣ kāle yam aṅgirā devo tharvā cā-* [2] *dhi tiṣṭhata z imaṁ ca lokaṁ paramaṁ ca lokaṁ puṇyāṅś ca lokān vidhṛtīś ca pu-* [3] *ṇyā | sarvāṅ lokān abhicitya vrahmanāṣ kālā sāiyyate paramo nu devaḥ z*

Read: kālo 'śvo vahati saptaraśmis sahasrākṣo akṣaro bhūriretāḥ | tam ā rohanti kavayo vipaścitas tasya cakrā bhuvanāni viśvā z 1 z sapta cakrā vahati kāla eṣa saptāsya nābhīr amṛtaṁ nv akṣaḥ | sa imā viśvā bhuvanāny añjan kālas seyate prathamo nu devaḥ z 2 z pūrṇaṣ kumbho adhi kāla āhitas taṁ vāi paśyāmo bahudhā nu santam | sa imā viśvā bhuvanāni pratyaṅ kālaṁ tam āhuṣ parame vyoman z 3 z sa eva saṁ bhuvanāny ābharat sa eva saṁ bhuvanāny paryāit | pitā sann abhavat putra eṣāṁ tasmād vāi nānyat param asti tejaḥ z 4 z kālo 'mūṁ divam ajanayat kāla imāṁ pṛthivīm uta | kālena bhūtaṁ bhavyaṁ ceṣitaṁ ha vi tiṣṭhate z 5 z kālo bhūtam asṛjata kāle tapatī sūryaḥ | kāle viśvā bhūtāni kāle cakṣur vi paśyati z 6 z kāle manaṣ kāle prāṇaṣ kāle nāma samāhitam | kālena sarvā nandanty āgatena prajā imāḥ z 7 z kāle tapaṣ kāle jyeṣṭhaṁ kāle vrahma samāhitam | kālo ha sarvasyeśvaro yaṣ pitāsīt prajāpateḥ z 8 z teneṣitaṁ tena jātaṁ tad u tasmin pratiṣṭhitam | kālo ha vrahma bhūtvā bibharti parameṣṭhinam z 9 z kālaṣ prajā asṛjata kālo 'gre prajāpatim | svayaṃbhūṣ kaśyapaṣ kālāt tapaṣ kālād ajāyata z 10 z kālād āpas sambhavan kālād vrahma tapo diśaḥ | kālenod eti sūryaṣ kālena viśate punaḥ z 11 z kālena vātaṣ pavate kālena <pṛthivī mahī | dyāur mahī kāla āhitā z 12 z kālo ha> bhūtaṁ bhavyaṁ ca putro 'janayat puraḥ | kālād ṛcas sam abhavan yajuṣ kālād ajāyata z 13 z kālo yajñaṁ sam āirayad devebhyo bhāgam akṣitam | kāle gandharvāpsarasaṣ kāle lokās sam āhitāḥ

z 14 z kāle 'yam aṅgirā devo 'tharvā cādhi tiṣṭhataḥ | imaṁ ca lokaṁ paramaṁ ca lokaṁ puṇyāṁś ca lokān vidhṛtīś ca puṇyāḥ z 15 z sarvāṅl lokān abhijitya vrahmaṇā kālas seyate paramo nu devaḥ z 16 z 2 z

These stanzas have been widely recognized as constituting one hymn in spite of the division in Ś. The text as emended here has a number of variations from that of Ś; but Whitney in his Translation gave up some of the readings of the Ś text as it stands in the Berlin edition.

3

[f142a4] *saptāitaṁ saptarṣayaś śalyakartā dvādaśa āddhiṁ śalyaṁ cākra-* [5] *tur indrarāśir mahodaraṁ z*

In pāda a saptāita would be an easy correction and somewhat probable; in b and c I believe there is mention of rice-harvest and would incline to understand a form śālya (< śāli) and read śālyakarttāro in b, and for c possibly āviddhaṁ śālyaṁ cakartur: in d indrarāśiṁ. Edgerton suggests saptāite, śalyakartāro, and śalyaṁ.

indrarāśir mittrāvaruṇāv āviddhaṁ nirakṛnta- [6] *taṁ | prasūtam indreṇogreṇa vrahmaṇā nāma sarvataḥ |*

In pāda a read °rāśiṁ mitrā°.

nāinam aśnīyātha vrahmaṇo [7] *na gṛhāṁ pra haret svāṁ tṛṣṭaṁ viṣam iva ta imātim indrarāśiḥ śāle śaye z*

Read aśnīyāta vrahmāṇo in a, gṛhān and svān in b, tāimātam in c.

[8] *ayaṁ śaye tanvo rakṣamāṇo ayaṁ śvinābhy avacakṣāṇe enaṁ |*

This, I believe, is a mutilated stanza; the first pāda as it stands would be pāda a, ayaṁ would perhaps be all that is left of pāda b, and aśvinābhy ° ° would be pāda d (with correction to °kṣāṇāv).

madhye khalasya [9] *nirmito indrarāśir mahodaraḥ | bhīmo anyasya śaṅkaśe aśvāivābhyutsinī na-* [10] *ḍaṁ |*

Read nirmita in pāda a: with śaṅkase c seems possible tho anyasya may need correction; in pāda d aśveva and naḍam seem clear but the intervening letters yield nothing to me.

yehendrarāśinnivayātu vardhayātu khalam ānyā sphātiṁ ca khālvāṁ [11] *gṛhṇātu gavāṁ ca bahu puṣyatu z*

For pāda a the best suggestion I can make is anyendrarāśir ivāitu; in b read vardhayatu ° anyā: in c khalyāṁ.

imov aśvinaḥ śepo im indro vrahmaṇa- [12] *spatiḥ tvaṁ cakra*

śivam asmabhya mṛṣayo ja tvaṁ cakra śivam asmabhya pṛṣayo [13] *jīvanāya kam.* |

In pāda a I would read yam †ov aśvinā, and possibly śepatur; in b yam: for cd tam śakra śivam asmabhyaṁ †mṛṣayo jīvanāya kam. In a Edgerton suggests yam v.

dṛḍhāṁśākuntamayaḥ dhṛtam āsīt svāpadaṁ | *pakturā-* [14] *s sṛpyantaḥ śera yā tanva hutaṁ haviḥ*

For pāda a I would suggest dṛḍhā aṁśāḥ kuntamayā, but it does not match pāda b; in b read āsīc chvāpadam: for pakturās in c I can offer nothing, but would suggest sarpantaḥ śere; for d we might read yat tanva āhutaṁ haviḥ. This is stanza 8.

anaḍuhāna pṛṣṇihān vahatāṁ vaharā- [15] *pṛṇāṁ* | *kīnāśasya samas tv edād indrarāśir ajāyatāḥ*

The ms seems to correct vahatāṁ to uhatāṁ.

For pādas ab I would suggest anaḍuhāṁ pṛṣṭivahāṁ vahatāṁ †vahar āpṛṇām; with edhād perhaps pāda c can stand, and in d read ajāyata. In c etad would be better than edhād.

yadi kīnā- [16] *nāśas sasvedeti sartastas tanvam pari* | *apāṁ gāveva dṛṣyantī indrarāśīṁ* [17] *so śnute* |

Read: yadi kīnāśas sasveda eti śirastas tanvaṁ pari | apāṁ gāva iva tṛṣyantīndrarāśiṁ so 'śnute. The correction of pāda b seems possible.

yadi kīnāsaṁ sīrupatir daṇḍena hantu manyataḥ yadi kiñ ca [18] *khalvaṁ sādānva indrarāśo udāhitam z*

In a read kīnāśaṁ sīra°, in b hanti manyutaḥ, in c sadānvā, in d probably indrarāśā udāhṛtam.

ulūkhala musulaṁ tāni co- [19] *dayan pa śūrpaṁ nāya pavate kṛṇuṣva* | *vāhi putrāya gotamam indrarāśi-* [20] *r madhumantaṁ kṛṇotu z*

In pāda a read ulūkhalaṁ musalaṁ; tāni may be corrupt; in b I think we should read pra śūrpaṁ naya: pāda c seems to lack three syllables possibly at the beginning.

etaś chūrpaṁ janitar āharolūkhalaṁ musulaṁ kustyā [f142b] *gahi putrā no tha sujanidve ahni pitusiṣṇaṁte madhumaṁnam āusaṁ* |

In pāda a read etac, in b read musalaṁ and possibly kumbhyā gahi: in c perhaps 'tha sujanitve, for d pitum aśnanti madhumantam oṣam.

agnin no ḍataḥ | [2] *prahito yam āgaṁ manaḥ maryam aṁnam aviṣaṁ kṛṇomi* |

For this I suggest: agnir no dūtaḥ prahito yam āgan mano manyam | annam aviṣaṁ kṛṇomi.

nirāviddham akṛtaṁ vrahma- [3] *ṇe no ado mandaṁ pitum avyaṣasūtā* | *svādo pito madhu pito tapa naṣ pitāv ā ga-* [4] *hi śivaś śivābhir ūtibhiḥ*

In pāda a read ākṛtaṁ, in b probably avyathasūtam; in c madho, in d upa naṣ pitāv. The last three pādas are RV 1.187.2a and 3ab, where ā cara is read.

siṁho bhūtvā gā mṛṇāny agnir bhūtvā dhānyaṁ indra [5] *rāśir nirmito mayāthāraṁ vācaṁ gaśchatu z*

Read: siṁho bhūtvā gā mṛṇāny agnir bhūtvā dhānyam | indrarāśir nirmito mayāthāraṁ vācaṁ gacchatu z 16 z 3 z

The indrarāśi which is praised here was probably a portion of threshed grain set aside for the chief of a small or perhaps large district. I have been able to get very little more out of the hymn.

4

(Ś 19.32)

[f142b5] *satakāṇḍo duścyavanas sahasrapa-* [6] *ṛṇam uttiraḥ darbho yo gra oṣadhis taṁ te badhnāmy āyuṣe z nāsya keśān pra vapanti* [7] *norasi tāḍam āghnatī* | *yasmāśchinnaparṇena darbheṇa śarma yaśchatu* | *divi te* [8] *tūlam oṣadhe pṛthivyām adhi niṣṭhitā* | *tayā sahasrakāṇḍenāyuṣ pra va-* [9] *rdhayāmahe* | *tisro divo ty atṛṇat tisro bhyāṁ pṛthivīm uta* | *tayā dṛhārdo ji-* [10] *hvā ni tṛṇādde vacāṁsi ca* | *tvam asi sahamāno aham asmi sahasvāṁ* | *u-* [11] *tāu sahasvantāu bhūtvā sapatnāt sahiṣīvahī* | *sahasvino bhimātihaṁ* [12] *sahasvā pṛtanāyataḥ sahasva sarvāṁ druhāndas svāhāndo me bahuṁ kṛ-* [13] *dhi* | *darbheṇa devajātena divaṣṭhambhena śaśvajit. tenāhaṁ sasvato danān a-* [14] *śanaṁ śanavāni ca* | *priyaṁ mā darbha kṛṇu vrahmarājanyābhyāṁ śūdrāya cā-* [15] *ryāya cāsmāi ca kāmayāmahe* | *sarvasmāi da vipaśyate* | *yo jāyamāna-* [16] *ṣ pṛthivīm adṛṁhad yo stabhnād antarikṣaṁ divaṁ ca* | *yaṁ bibhratam nanu pāpmā vi-* [17] *veda sa no yaṁ darbho dharuṇo dhivākaḥ z sapatnahā śatakāṇḍas sahasvān o-* [18] *ṣadhīnāṁ prathamaḥ saṁ babhūva ma no yaṁ darbhaṣ pari pātu viśvataḥ tena sā-* [19] *kṣiya mṛtanā pṛtanyataḥ z 5 z*

Read: śatakāṇḍo duścyavanas sahasraparṇam uttiraḥ | darbho ya ugra oṣadhis taṁ te badhnāmy āyuṣe z 1 z nāsya keśān pra vapanti norasi tāḍam ā ghnate | yasmā achinnaparṇena darbheṇa śarma yacchati z 2 z divi te tūlam oṣadhe pṛthivyām adhi niṣṭhitaḥ | tvayā sahasrakāṇḍenāyuṣ pra vardhayāmahe z 3 z tisro divo 'ty atṛṇat tisro dyāṁ pṛthivīm uta | tvayā durhārdo jihvāṁ ni tṛṇadmi vacāṅsi ca z 4 z tvam asi sahamāno aham asmi sahasvān | ubhāu sahasvantāu bhūtvā sapatnānt sahiṣīvahi z 5 z sahasva no 'bhimātiṁ sahasva pṛtanāyataḥ | sahasva sarvāṅ durhārdas suhārdo me bahūn kṛdhi z 6 z darbheṇa devajātena diviṣṭhambhena śaśvad it | tenāhaṁ śaśvato janān asanaṁ sanavāni ca z 7 z priyaṁ mā darbha kṛṇu vrahmarājanyābhyāṁ śūdrāya cāryāya ca | yasmāi 'ca kāmayāmahe sarvasmāi ca vipaśyate z 8 z yo jāyamānaṣ pṛthivīm adṛṁhad yo 'stabhnād antarikṣaṁ divaṁ ca | yaṁ bibhrataṁ nanu pāpmā viveda sa no 'yaṁ darbho dharuṇo 'dhivākaḥ z 9 z sapatnahā śatakāṇḍas sahasvān oṣadhīnāṁ prathamaḥ saṁ babhūva | sa no 'yaṁ darbhaṣ pari pātu viśvatas tena sākṣīya pṛtanāḥ pṛtanyataḥ z 10 z 4 z

This is very close to the text of Ś; in the case of the most notable variations (in 1b, 3a, and 9d) Whitney in his Translation has adopted the Pāipp readings, most of which are those of the Ś mss. Whether 4b can stand as given here is doubtful; Ś has tisra imāḥ pṛthivīr uta.

5

(Ś 19.33)

[f142b19] *sahasārghyaś śatakāṇḍaṣ payasvā-* [20] *n apām agnir vīrudhāṁ rāsūyaṁ | sa no yaṁ darbhaṣ pari pātu viśvato dāivo* [21] *maṇir āyuṣā saṁ sṛjātu naḥ z 1 z ghṛtāl ullubdho madhuvāṁ paya-* [f143a] *svaṇ bhūmidruho cyuta cyāvayiṣṇuḥ nudan sapatnān adharāṅś ca kaṇvan darbhā roha* [2] *mahatā mahendriyeṇa z 2 z tvaṁ bhūmig abhy esy ojasā tvaṁ ve-* [3] *dyāṁ śirasi cārur adhvā | tvāṁ pravitram ṛṣayo bharantas tvaṁ puniha duritāny a-* [4] *smat. z 3 z tīkṣṇo rājā viṣāsahi rakṣohā viśvacarṣaṇī | tejo de-* [5] *vānāṁ balam ugram etat tat te badhnāmi jarase svastaye z 4 z darbheṇa tvaṁ kṛ-* [6] *kṛṇu vīryāṇi darbhaṁ bibhratātmanā mā vyathiṣṭhāḥ atiṣṭhāpo varcase dhv a-* [7] *nyā sūryāivā bhāhi pradiśaś catasra z 5 z*

Read: sahasrārghyaś śatakāṇḍaṣ payasvān apām agnir vīrudhāṁ rājasūyam | sa no 'yaṁ darbhaṣ pari pātu viśvato dāivo maṇir

āyuṣā saṁ sṛjāti naḥ z 1 z ghṛtād ullabdho madhumān payasvān bhūmidṛṁho 'cyutaś cyāvayiṣṇuḥ | nudan sapatnān adharāṁś ca kṛṇvan darbhā roha mahatām indriyeṇa z 2 z tvaṁ bhūmim aty eṣy ojasā tvaṁ vedyāṁ sīdasi cārur adhvare | tvāṁ pavitram ṛṣayo 'bharanta tvaṁ punīhi duritāny asmat z 3 z tīkṣṇo rājā viṣāsahī rakṣohā viśvacarṣaṇiḥ | tejo devānāṁ balam ugram etat tat te badhnāmi jarase svastaye z 4 z darbheṇa tvaṁ kṛṇu vīryāṇi darbhaṁ bibhrad ātmanā mā vyathiṣṭhāḥ | atiṣṭhāya varcase 'dhy anyān sūrya ivā bhāhi pradiśaś catasraḥ z 5 z 5 z

In 3c I have adopted (with Whitney) the reading of SPP; in 5c Ś has (by emendation) varcasādhy. The compound of ud + labh (st 2a) is not quotable, but it seems to me quite as good as Ś ullupto.

6

[f143a7] *ud īrataṁ pṛthivī jīra-* [8] *dānuś śātenāmantarvān anu vāti vātā | ṛdvyāvatī pṛthivī prati gṛ-* [9] *hṇātu vījaṁ sahasravaluśaṁ sudughā rohantī z 1*

Pāda a is correct; in b a probable reading is arvān anu vāti vātaḥ, but I can make nothing of śātenāmant: in c read ūrjāvatī and bījaṁ, in d °valiśaṁ.

indra ca nāṁ haryaśvo [10] *agnir vā rohitāśvaḥ aśvinā rāsabhāśvā kṛṣiṁ devīm ayoyujaṁ*

In pāda a read indraś cāināṁ, in d ayoyujan.

śu- [11] *naṁ vṛtrām ā yaścha śunam aṣṭrām ud iṅgayaḥ śunaṁ tu tapyatāṁ phālaś śunaṁ vaha-* [12] *tu lāṅgalaṁ z 3 z*

Over the last syllable of pāda b the ms has " 2."

In pāda a read varatrām ā yaccha, in b iṅgaya: in d lāṅgalam. For our ab cf. Ś. 3. 17. 6cd.

yunaktu vāhā vyogā tano ihate kṣettre vapateha bī- [13] *jaṁ tathā dhātā tathā bhagas tathā kṛṇutām aśvinā z 4 z tathā devī* [14] *sarasvatī |*

In pādas ab read yunakta, and vi yugā tanoteha te kṣetre. Period and numeral to be placed at end. In the right margin at the end of line 13 the ms corrects vapa° to vapya°. For our ab cf Ś 3. 17. 2ab.

supippalā oṣadhayo nāhīnām akṣataḥ tad indro varu- [15] *ṇo vāyur aśvinedaṁ me prāvatā vacaḥ z*

Probably tad is the end of pāda b but I can make no satisfactory

suggestion for the pāda; the rest can stand but the metre is irregular: for pāda a cf Ś 3. 17. 5a, and for pāda d cf RV 10. 97. 14d.

dhātā pūṣā vṛhaspati bhū- [16] *myāḥ samajīm akaṁ kṛṣiṁ devās svarvidaḥ kalyāṇī subhageva yā* |

In pāda a read °patir, in b akran, and possibly samīcīm before it.

[17] *saṁsthāyān vapuṣenyāsān astrirātra madhumaṁnam aṁśaṁ* | *anyasya bhāumā* [18] *puruṣasya bhāumā paśūnāṁ nu hi śrayantāṁ z*

In the right margin the ms has saṁśayaṁ, probably to correct the end of pāda b; there is also an interlinear correction indicating the insertion of a second bhāumā before paśūnāṁ.

For pāda a possibly we might read saṁsthāpyān vapuṣe ny āsan, or something like that; in b I would read madhumantam aṁśam, but I cannot solve astrirātra. Insert bhāumā at the beginning of pāda d as the ms indicates.

tīvrā varṣanto vṛṣṭayo [19] *bhūpaye mahame vṛdhe z z pinvānaṣ parjanyas tiṣṭhata sā puruṣāyod a-* [20] *yati sūryaḥ ānandaṁ janayan yuva sarvārātīr apabādhamānaḥ*

In the right margin the ms corrects to (varṣa)ntu.

In pādas ab read varṣantu and bhūtaye mahase; in c read tiṣṭhati, in d sa and eti, in e yuvat or possibly janayaty uta, in f sarvā arātīr.

vi- [f143b] *jīṣva pṛthvi mayūr vipakṣa mṛdvī bhava bhadraṁ rohatu dhānyaṁ z*

In pāda a read vi jihīṣva, in b vipakṣā (from vipakṣas); mayūr I cannot solve.

utsedha seda gājaṁ [2] *vindeherān vahas kṛdhi* | *mā ho riṣat kūṭagrāho mā vā śālilāñgalam.* [3] *z*

In pāda a read sedha and possibly gā ajān, in b °erāṁ and probably vāhaṣ; in c no.

soṣmākam ugrās saṁrabdhās tan naṣ kiṁ canāmamat. z rāyas poṣaṁ śunāsī- [4] *rā yo sītā bhagaś ca yaḥ* |

In the left margin is " tho."

For pāda a we may read so 'smākam ugras saṁrabdhas, in b I would suggest taṁ na; in cd °sīrātho.

jyeṣṭhī samudra sinīvālī kṛṣiṁ no bhī- [5] *hītvataḥ imā yāṣ pañca pradiśas tā vāto bhīhīnvatu* | *valīke* [6] *satvatām iva tīvrā varṣantu vṛṣṭayaḥ*

Over the third sign in line 5 in written nva.

In pāda a jyāiṣṭhī would probably be better, and samudraṁ is the only suggestion I can make for the second word; in b read no ʿbhīhenvataḥ; in d read ʿbhīhenvatu: the last two pādas seem possible as they stand, and it seems better to take them into this stanza.

[7] *śunaṁ kīnāśo anveti vāhāṁ | śunaṁ phālo vinataṁ nayatu bhūmiṁ | śunāsī-* [8] *rā haviṣā vāvṛdhānāḥ śunaṁ dhānyāni kṛṇutaṁ*

In pāda a read vāhān, remove colon, in b probably vinītām etu bhūmim; in c vāvṛdhānā, in d kṛṇutam. Cf Ś 3. 17. 5.

yuvaṁ naṣ pīparad aśvi- [9] *nā jyotiṣmatī tamas tiraḥ tām asmāi rāśayatām iṣāṁ z*

Read: yā naṣ pīparad aśvinā jyotiṣmatī tamas tiraḥ | tām asme rāsāthām iṣam z 14 z 6 z

For this stanza see Ś 19. 40. 4 and RV 1. 46. 6.

7

[f143b9] *ūrdhvaśvito vāi* [10] *nāmāitāpo yadhāuṣadhayaś ca vanaspatayaś ca tāsām agnir adhipatiḥ yo* [11] *vāyatā ūrdhvaśvitāpo vedāgniṁ adhipatiṁ | athāitam etā ūrdhvā upa tiṣṭha-* [12] *nty evāinam ūrdhvā | upa tiṣṭhanty adhipatir bhavati svānāṁ cānyeṣāṁ ca ya evaṁ veda* [13] *praskadvarī vāi nāmāitāpo yat paruṣvās tāsām ādityo adhipatiḥ yo vā-* [14] *yatāṣ praskadvarīr āpo veda ādityam adhipatiṁ | athāitā etasminn udyati pra-* [15] *skaṅdaṅty evāsmin yāvati praskandanty adhipatiḥ z 2 z takvarīr vāi nā-* [16] *māitāpo yā sūdaya tāsāṁ pṛthivy ādhipatnī yo vāyatās takvarīr ā-* [17] *po veda pṛthivīm adhipatnī athāitā etasyāṁ praṇutās takaṅtīr iyaṅty e-* [18] *vāinena dviṣantaḥ praṇutā yanty adhipati z vaśinī vāi nāmāitāpo yā* [19] *syandaṅte tāsāṁ varuṇo adhipatiḥ yo vāyatā vaśinīr āpo veda* [f144a] *varuṇam adhipatiṁ | athāiṣetāsāṁ syandamānānāṁ vaśam ādatta evā dviṣatāṁ vaśam ādatte* [2] *adhipati ūrjevāi nāmāitāpo yad bhāvas thāsāṁ tvaṣṭā adhipatayaḥ yo vāyatā ūrjapo ve-* [3] *da tvāṣṭāram adhipatiṁ ūrjasvī tejasvī bhavati | prasahan paśūn āpnoty adhipatiḥ ojo* [4] *vāi nāmāitāpo yan madhu tāsāṁ indro adhipatnīpatīn. | ojasvī vīryāvān indriyā-* [5] *vāi bhavati pararāja sabhāyāṁ madhuparkam āpnoty adhipatiḥ z 6 z varco vāi nāmāi-* [6] *tāpo yad ghṛtaṁ tāsāṁ pūṣāṁ adhipatayaḥ yo vāyatā varcāpo veda pūṣaṇam adhipa-* [7] *tayaḥ yo vāyatā varcāpo veda pūṣaṇam adhipatiṁ varcasvī tejasvī*

*bhavaty e | [8] tasyānityuktasya mukhaṁ rocate adhipatiḥ ugrā vāi namāitāpo yad dhrādudaya- [9] s tāsāṁ maruto * * * * * * grāpo veda maruto [10] adhipatīn. ugro balavān bhavati mārutaṁ śardha ity enam āhur adhipatiḥ | z [11] saho vāi nāmāitāpo yad varṣaṁ tāsāṁ parjanyo adhipatayaḥ yo vāyatā maruto [12] veda | parjanyam adhipatim ahassvāi mittrabāhavo bhavaty ethainena svā nandanty a- [13] smāg vayam iti asmāś charvo vṛṣṭe mahīyate adhipatiḥ z abhimanya vāi nā- [14] māitāpo yat svarā tāsām aśvināvabhipatīn. z yo vāyatām abhimanyāpo veda [15] aśvināṁ adhipatīn. abhimanyate bhrātṛvyā nāinaṁ bhrātṛvyābhimanyante tasmā- [16] n maṅtor mattam anumate adhipatiḥ paricinto vāi nāmāitāpo yāḥ kariṣvāṅs tāṁ [17] yamo adhipatiḥ yo vāyatā paricitir āpo veda imam adhipatiṁ [18] pary eṇaṁ syāsya viśvāsyā vaśyanty adhipatiḥ z raṅtayo vāi [19] nāmāitāpo yās striyās tāsāṁ kāmo adhipatiḥ yo vāyatāṁ raṅtīr ā- [f144b] po veda kāmam adhipatiṁ ramante smin ramaṇiyo yo [2] bhavati kāmāiva strīṇāṁ adhipatiḥ z viśvabhṛto vāi nāmāitāpo yat puru- [3] ṣas tāsāṁ mṛtyur adhipatīn. viśvasya bhartā bhavati viśam enaṁ vibhartāḥ sa [4] trayo agnayo gṛha dhīyante | dakṣiṇāgni gārhaspatyāhavanīyaḥ e- [5] nam catvāri vāmāni gaśchanti niṣkaḥ kaṅso aśvataro sty adhipatiḥ z [6] imāṁ vāya tāsāṁ apām himavā nāudhaḥ somo [7] vatsaḥ parameṣṭhy adhipatiḥ yo vāya tāsām apāṁ himavantaṁ nāudhaṁ somaṁ va- [8] tsaṁ parameṣṭhy adhipatiṣ parameṣṭhī bhavatu gaśchatu parameṣṭhiṅ rāma- [9] m adhipatir bhavati svānāṁ cānyeṣāṁ ca ya evaṁ veda zz zz [10] ity atharvaṇikapāipalādaśākhāyāṁ dvādaśaṣ kāṇḍas samāptāḥ z z*

Read: ūrdhvaścuto vāi nāmāitā āpo yad oṣadhayaś ca vanaspatayaś ca tāsām agnir adhipatiḥ | yo vā etā ūrdhvaścuta āpo vedāgnim adhipatim | athāitam etā ūrdhvā upa tiṣṭhanty evāinam ūrdhvā upa tiṣṭhanty adhipatir bhavati svānāṁ cānyeṣāṁ ca ya evaṁ veda z 1 z

praskadvarīr vāi nāmāitā āpo yat paruṣās tāsām ādityo adhipatiḥ | yo vā etāṣ praskadvarīr āpo vedādityam adhipatim | athāitā etasminn udyati praskandanty evāsminn āyati praskandanty adhipatir ° ° z 2 z

takvarīr vāi nāmāitā āpo yāḥ sūdayas tāsāṁ pṛthivy adhipatnī | yo vā etās takvarīr āpo veda pṛthivīm adhipatnīm | athāitā etasyāṁ praṇuttās takantīr yanty evāinena dviṣantaḥ praṇuttā yanty adhipatir ° ° z 3 z

vaśinīr vāi nāmāitā āpo yāḥ syandante tāsāṁ varuṇo adhipatiḥ | yo vā etā vaśinīr āpo veda varuṇam adhipatim | athāiṣa etāsāṁ syandamānānāṁ vaśam ādatta evā dviṣatāṁ vaśam ādatte adhipatir ° ° z 4 z

ūrjā vāi nāmāitā āpo yad bhāvas tāsāṁ tvaṣṭādhipatiḥ | yo vā etā ūrjāpo veda tvaṣṭāram adhipatim | ūrjasvī tejasvī bhavati prasahan paśūn āpnoty adhipatir ° ° z 5 z

ojo vāi nāmāitā āpo yan madhu tāsām indro adhipatiḥ | < yo vā etā oja āpo vedendram adhipatim > | ojasvī vīryāvān indriyāvī bhavati pararājaḥ sabhāyāṁ madhuparkam āpnoty adhipatir ° ° z 6 z

varco vāi nāmāitā āpo yad ghṛtaṁ tāsāṁ pūṣādhipatiḥ | yo vā etā varca āpo veda pūṣāṇam adhipatim | varcasvī tejasvī bhavaty †etasyān ity uktasya mukhaṁ rocate adhipatir ° ° z 7 z

ugrā vāi nāmāitā āpo yad dhrādunayas tāsāṁ maruto < adhipatayaḥ | yo vā etā > ugrā āpo veda maruto adhipatīn | ugro balavān bhavati mārutaṁ śardha ity enam āhur adhipatir ° ° z 8 z

saho vāi nāmāitā āpo yad varṣaṁ tāsāṁ parjanyo adhipatiḥ | yo vā etāḥ saha āpo veda parjanyam adhipatim | athāsmāi mitrabāhavo bhavanty athāinena svā nandanty asmād vayam ity asmāc charvo vṛṣṭe mahīyate adhipatir ° ° z 9 z

abhimanyā vāi nāmāitā āpo yat svarā tāsām aśvinādhipatī | yo vā etā abhimanyā āpo vedāśvināv adhipatī | abhimanyate bhrātṛvyāṅ nāinaṁ bhrātṛvyā abhimanyante tasmān mantor †mattam anumanyate adhipatir ° ° z 10 z

paricito vāi nāmāitā āpo yāḥ †kariṣyāṅs tāsāṁ yamo adhipatiḥ | yo vā etāḥ paricito āpo veda yamam adhipatim | pary enaṁ †syāsya viśvāsya† vaśanty adhipatir ° ° z 11 z

rantayo vāi nāmāitā āpo yās striyas tāsāṁ kāmo adhipatiḥ | yo va etā rantīr āpo veda kāmam adhipatim | ramante 'smin ramaṇīyo bhavati kāma eva strīṇām adhipatir ° ° z 12 z

viśvabhṛto vāi nāmāitā āpo yat puruṣas tāsāṁ mṛtyur < adhipatiḥ | yo vā etā viśvabhṛto āpo veda mṛtyum > adhipatim | viśvasya bhartā bhavati viśvam enaṁ bibhrataḥ saṁ trayo agnayo gṛhe dhīyante dakṣiṇāgnir gārhapatya āhavanīyaḥ | enaṁ catvāri vāmāni gacchanti niṣkakaṇṭho aśvataro 'sty adhipatir ° ° z 13 z

'himā vāi < nāmāitā āpo yat * * > tāsām apāṁ himavāṅ nodhāḥ somo vatsaḥ parameṣṭhy adhipatiḥ | yo vā < etā himā āpo veda > tāsām apāṁ himavantaṁ nodhasaṁ somaṁ vatsaṁ parameṣṭhinam

adhipatim | parameṣṭhī bhavati gacchati †parameṣṭhin rāmam adhipatir bhavati svānāṁ cānyeṣāṁ ca ye evaṁ veda z 14 z 7 z

ity atharvaṇikapāippalādasākhāyāṁ dvādaśaṣ kāṇḍas samāptaḥ z z

In st 8 [d]hrādayyās might be considered as an alternative to [d]hrādunayas. In st 11 karīṣās has been suggested, but it does not seem as probable to me as karīrās. In st 14 I am doubtful about nodhāḥ (ms nāudhaḥ and nāudham): in the last clause parameṣṭhe rāmam might be considered possible. In st 9 mitrā bahavo would seem more suitable.

A MANDAIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

CARL H. KRAELING
LUTHERAN SEMINARY AT PHILADELPHIA

IN THE LATTER HALF of the last century the interest of prominent orientalists was attracted to an ancient religious sect, the Mandeans or Nasoreans, still surviving in the swampy lowlands of Mesopotamia about Basra. As texts of their extensive sacred writings and a knowledge of their peculiar practices reached Europe, it became evident: (1) that they represent a remnant of the Sabeans of early Mohammedan times; (2) that their language is an East Aramaic dialect akin to Syriac and the Aramaic of the Talmud Babli.

Recently students of Hellenistic and Christian antiquity have been profundly interested by the theology and religious lore of the Mandeans. It was observed that tho none of their texts actually antedate the Mohammedan era, the peculiar form of thought they represent belongs in a general way to the syncretistic developments of the early Christian period. Both their name and their antique theological tradition stamp them as a Mesopotamian branch of the great family of Gnostic sects. The Mandean writings thus rank alongside the well-known group of Coptic Gnostic documents, as first-hand sources for the forgotten faiths of the later East, known until recently only from the polemical works of the Christian heresiologists.

The discovery of extensive Manichean texts in Turfan, giving prima facie evidence for a third Gnostic religion, and a further insight into the situation in Mesopotamia in Christian times, has already raised the question of the interrelation of the two contemporary forms of Mesopotamian Gnosis. Taking the Mandean and the Manichean texts together with what the Chronicle of Arbela has to say, it should eventually be possible to gain a fairly definite picture of the religious status of the Tigris-Euphrates country in the early centuries. But the discovery in Turfan has had even more far-reaching results.

Two things have become increasingly evident to those interested in Hellenistic religious developments as a whole: (1) that

to fathom the religious complex of this age or more specifically to answer the question of Hellenism and Christianity, it is necessary to operate genetically; (2) that the controlling forces in the religious evolution of the time are eastern.

The key to the riddle of the early Christian centuries is the religion of the East from the Persian period upward. Unfortunately sources for this period are almost entirely lacking. Orthodox Judaism was until recently the only calculable factor. The Manichean texts were revolutionizing in importance because they gave evidence of the continued existence of ancient Iranian beliefs in the old centres of civilization, tho often in new forms. The Mandean sources ranged alongside the Manichean, showed sufficicient correspondence in point of view to suggest the existence of a Neo-Iranian or Proto-Gnostic atmosphere in Mesopotamia, which if its elements become more discernable will serve to fill in part the lacuna represented by the immediately pre-Christian centuries in religious matters. The Mandean texts attained to independent importance in that they seemed to preserve more of the Neo-Babylonian thought, or rather more of the Babylonian elements of the Proto-Gnostic atmosphere. The clues to this pre-Gnostic faith, built upon the old religions of the East, have hitherto been examined only in so far as they may have bearing upon the question of the origin of the Hellenistic ideas and means of redemption.

Mandean scriptures promise to be of some slight importance for the study of Judaism. It appears that these "baptists" were not originally indigenous to Mesopotamia, but that their first home, which they left at an early date, was the region of the Hauran. The extensive Jewish elements in their tradition, if they go back to this period of Mandean history, would give us a glimpse into the non-orthodox movements centering about Jewish thought, similar to that afforded by the Zadokite Document, and thus eventually furnish a check upon the interpretation of the orthodox thought itself.

Finally too, the Mandeans may be of some importance for nascent Christianity. They claim to be the disciples of John the Baptist, and, indeed, harbor a great amount of legendary tradition concerning the "last of the prophets." They stood at an early time simultaneously in contrast both to Christianity and to orthodox

Judaism. That there existed in the first century something of a divergence in view-point between the disciples of Jesus and the disciples of John has frequently been gleaned from the New Testament material on the subject. If, as it is said, the early Christians actually endeavored to belittle and thus to supplant the Johannine movement, and the Mandeans are truly sprung from the movement begun by John, they may aid in giving us a more realistic impression of the vitality and individuality of the Baptist point of view, one that will aid in correctly interpreting the situations suggested in Acts and portions of the Synoptic Gospels.

To delineate correctly the history of the Mandeans from purely internal evidence, to distinguish the relative priority of the diverse influences playing upon them at different tmes, and to estimate their importance in reconstructing Baptist, Judaistic, Proto-Gnostic and Gnostic thought, all from documents of the Mohammedan era embodying unquestionably ancient tradition, that is the difficult but fascinating problem presented by the Mandean sources. The work has scarcely begun, but, as the appended bibliography shows, promises to draw the interest of students of Oriental, Hellenistic, Jewish, and Christian religions alike.

TEXTS

1. *Theological.*

Genza.

Codex Nasaraeus, liber Adami appelatus, syriace transcriptus latineque redditus. 3 vols. of text, London, 1815-17, ed. M. Norberg.

Thesaurus, sive Liber Magnus, vulgo Liber Adami appellatus, ed. H. Petermann. 2 vols., Berlin and Leipzig, 1867.

Mandäische Schriften. Transl. of parts of the Genza. W. Brandt. Leipzig, 1893.

Das mandäische Königsbuch. Text and transl. S. Ochser, Zeitschr. f. Assyr. vol. 19 (1905-6), p. 64-97. Comprises pp. 378-394 of vol. I of Petermann, Thesaurus.

Die mandäische Gnomologie Johannes des Täufers. Text and transl. S. Ochser. Zeitschr. f. Assyr. vol. 20 (1907), pp. 1-15. Comprises Right Genza tract 14.

Ein mandäischer Traktat. Translation with notes and introduction. Theo. Nöldeke, in Aufsätze zur Kultur und Sprachengeschichte. . . des Orients Ernst Kuhn zum 70. Geburtstage gewidmet. Breslau, 1916, pp. 131-138. Comprises Petermann, Thesaurus, vol. I, pp. 278-282.

24557

Ginza. Der Schatz oder das grosse Buch der Mandäer. Übersetzt und erklärt von Mark Lidzbarski. Quellen der Religionsgeschichte vol. 13. Göttingen, 1925.

Book of John.

Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer. Text, transl. and notes, 2 vols., ed. by M. Lidzbarski. Giessen, 1905-15.

(A Coptic ostracon of the 5th Cent., which formed part of an index to a monastery library records among the books of this library one bearing the title of a "Book of John Baptist"; cf. Receuil de travaux relatifs à la philologie égypt. et assyr., XI. 135. Was this a Coptic version of the Book of John?)

2. *Liturgical.*

Qolasta oder Gesänge u. Lehren von der Taufe u. dem Ausgang der Seele. Text, ed. J. Euting, Stuttgart, 1867.

The trials of a candidate from the Mandean "Book of Souls." Transl. of Qolasta 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, with notes. A. L. B. Hardcastle. Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Archeol., vol. 38 (1916), pp. 11-18. London.

Mandäische Liturgien. Text and transl., ed. M. Lidzbarski. Abhandl. d. königl. Gesellsch. d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, phil. hist. Klasse, Neue Folge, vol. XVII, 1. Berlin, 1920. Comprises the Qolasta and the Oxford Liturgical Collection.

Textes mandaïtes, avec une notice sur les Mandéens par Cl. Huart: in J. de Morgan, Mission scientifique en Perse, Tome V, 2. Paris, 1904. Comprises the Iniani, the Sidra di Nischmata, and the Qmaha di Hibil Ziwa.

Sidra di Nischmata. Text and transl. by S. Ochser, ZDMG, vol. 61 (1907), pp. 145-177 and 356-369. Comprises J. de Morgan V. 2, pp. 207-252.

3. *Magical.*

Inscriptions mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir. Text, transl., and philological commentary, 2 vols., ed. H. Pognon. Paris, 1898-9.

Mandäische Zaubertexte. Text and transl., ed. M. Lidzbarski, in Ephemeris f. semit. Epigraphik, vol. I, pt. 1, pp. 89-106 (1900).

Ein mandäisches Amulett. Text and transl., ed. M. Lidzbarski, in Florilegium: Receuil de Travaux dediés à Melchior de Vogüé, pp. 349-373. Paris, 1910.

Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur. Text and transl. with comm., ed. J. A. Montgomery, pp. 244-255. Philadelphia, 1913.

Mandäischer Diwan nach photogr. Aufnahme von Dr. B. Poertner. A photographic reproduction of text with drawings, ed. J. Euting. Strassburg, 1904.

4. *Unpublished texts listed in*

J. Euting. Nachrichten über die mandäischen oder zabischen Manu-

skripte der kaiserl. Bibliothek zu Berlin u. d. Bib. des British Museum zu London. ZDMG, vol. 19 (1865), pp. 120-36.

Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Catalogue des manuscrits syriaques et sabéens. Paris, 1874.

PHILOLOGY

Lexicon to the Genza and Onomasticon (unreliable) in vol. 4-5 of Norberg's edition of the Genza. London, 1815-17.

Über die Mundart der Mandäer. Theo. Nöldeke. Abhandl. d. k. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften z. Göttingen, phil-hist. Klasse, vol. 10 (1862).

Mandäische Grammatik. Theo. Nöldeke. Halle, 1875.

Onomasticon to the liturgies in Lidzbarski: Mandäische Liturgien.

Glosses Babylo-Araméennes. J. N. Epstein in Revue des Études Juives, vol. 73, pp. 27-58; vol. 74, pp. 40-72 (1921-22).

DISCUSSIONS

Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus. D. Chwolsohn. St. Petersburg, 1856; 2 vols.

Reisen im Orient. H. Petermann, 1861; vol. II, pp. 96-123.

Die Mandäer. J. Euting, in "Das Ausland," 1876, pp. 221-225.

Études sur la religion des Soubbas ou Sabéens, leurs dogmes, leurs moeurs. M. N. Siouffi. Paris, 1880.

Les Mandaïtes, leur histoire et leurs doctrines. E. Babelon, Paris, 1882.

Die Mandäische Religion, ihre Entwickelung und geschichtliche Bedeutung. W. Brandt. Leipzig, 1889.

Notes on the Sabaeans. A. Houtom-Schindler: in Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society, New Series, vol. 13 (1891), pp. 663-669. Bibliography of older material given here.

Das Schicksal der Seele nach dem Tode nach mandäischen und persischen Darstellungen. W. Brandt, in Jahrbücher f. protestantische Theologie, XVIII (1892), pp. 405-438, 575-603.

Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnostizismus. W. Anz. Texte u. Untersuchungen, ed. Gebhardt u. Harnack, XV. 4 (1897), pp. 70-78.

Die Himmelsreise der Seele. W. Bousset. Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft, vol. 4 (1901), pp. 136-169, 229-273.

Mandäer. K. Kessler: in Protestantische Realenzyklopädie³, 1903. Bibliography of older material here.

Mandäische Probleme nach ihrer religionsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung. K. Kessler. Akten des 2. internationalen religionswissenschaftlichen Kongresses zu Basel. 1904.

Uthra und Malakha. M. Lidzbarski, in Orientalische Studien Theo. Nöldeke gewidmet (1906), vol. I, pp. 537-545.

Das vermutliche babylonische Vorbild des Pehta und Mambuha der Mandäer. H. Zimmern, in Orientalische Studien Theo. Nöldeke gewidmet (1906), pp. 959-967.

Hauptprobleme der Gnosis. W. Bousset. Göttingen, 1907; in Forschungen zur Religion u. Literatur des A. u. N. T., ed. Bousset u. Gunkel, vol. 10.

Die Mandäer, ihre Religion und Geschichte. W. Brandt (posthumous). Verhandelingen der Akademie v. Wetenschappen, Amsterdam; Afdeeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, XVI. 3 (1915).

Die Göttin Psyche. R. Reitzenstein. Sitzungsberichte d. Heidelberger Akademie d. Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1917, no. 10.

Mandaeiske Studier. Svend Aage Pallis. Kopenhagen, 1919.

Das mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grösse u. d. Evangelienüberlieferung. Sitzb. d. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Klasse, 1919, no. 12.

Nazoräer. H. Zimmern in ZDMG, vol. 74 (1920), pp. 429-38.

La religione dei Mandei. U. Fracassini, in Giornale della Societa Asiatica Italiana, vol. 29 (1921), pp. 131-177.

Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium. R. Reitzenstein. Bonn, 1921.

Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem des Ursprungs der hellenistischen Erlösungsreligion. H. Gressmann. Zeitschrift f. Kirchengeschichte, vols. XL, XLI (1921-22), pp. 178-191, 154-180.

Die Entstehung der manichäischen Religion u. des Erlösungsmysterium I. Scheftelowitz. Giessen, 1922.

Urmensch und Seele in der iranischen Überlieferung. O. G. von Wesendonk. Hannover, 1924, Chap. 5.

Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen u. manichäischen Quellen für das Verständniss des Johannesevangeliums. R. Bultmann in ZNW, vol. XXIV, Hft. 1-2. (1925.)

Reviews

Lagarde, review of Brandt, Mandäische Religion, in Gött. Gelehrte Anzeigen, 1890, no. 10, pp. 385-404.

J. Land, review of same, in "De Outraadseling van het Mandaisme." Theologische Tijdschrift, 1890, no. 2, pp. 113-126.

J. Wellhausen, review of same, in Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 1890, no. 19, col. 473-478.

B. Eerdmans, review of same, in Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie, 1894, vol. 9, pp. 133-140.

G. Krüger, review of same, in Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1894, no. 14, col. 370.

M. Lidzbarski, review of Pognon, Coupes de Khouabir, in Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1899, no. 6, col. 171-3.

S. Fraenkel, review of Ochser, Gnomologie Jh. des Täufers, in Zeitschrift f. Assyriologie, vol. 20 (1907), pp. 1-15.

M. Lidzbarski, review of Ochser, Sidra di Nischmata, "Das mandäische Seelenbuch," in ZDMG, vol. 61 (1907), pp. 689-98.

S. Ochser, answer to Lidzbarski's review above, "Zur Kritik der Sidra di Nischmata," ZDMG, vol. 61 (1907), pp. 918-20.

Theo. Nöldeke, review of Lidzbarski, Johannesbuch, in Zeitschr. f. Assyr. vol. 30 (1915), pp. 139-60.

Theo. Nöldeke, review of Brandt, Mandäer, in Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie, vol. 30 (1915), pp. 160-162.

Theo. Nöldeke, review of Lidzbarski, Mandäische Liturgien, in Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie, vol. 33 (1921), pp. 72-80.

M. Lidzbarski, answer to Zimmern, Nazoraios, in Zeitschr. f. Semitistik u. verwandte Gebiete, vol. 1 (1922), pp. 230-233.

M. Lidzbarski, answer to Nöldeke's review of Mandäische Liturgien, in "Zu den mandäischen Liturgien," in Zeitschr. f. Semitistik, etc., vol. 1 (1922), pp. 1-2.

M. Dibelius, review of Scheftelowitz, Ursprung etc., in Theologische Literaturzeitung, vol. 48 (Oct. 16, 1923), no. 20.

R. Reitzenstein, review of Scheftelowitz, Ursprung etc., in Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen, 1923, Jan. to April, pp. 37-58.

BRIEF NOTES

Alleged intensive noun-formations in the Semitic

A view of the Aramaic grammars reveals a category of nouns which the several grammarians assign in general to intensive formations, *qattal, qittal,* or *quttal.* For lists of such nouns in the respective dialects see Kautzsch, *Gramm. d. Biblisch-Aramäisch,* § 50, 1, c; Duval, *Gramm. syriaque,* § 237; Nöldeke, *Syrische Gramm.,* § 114, and *Mandäische Gramm.,* § 102; Levias, *Grammar of the Aramaic Idiom contained in the Bab. Talmud,* §§ 876-881; Dalman, *Gram. d. jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*[2], § 29, 1. The same postulation of intensive formations is also maintained in the comparative grammars, Barth, *Nominalbildung,* § 15, cf. p. xxx; Brockelmann, *Vergleichende Gramm.* 1, §§ 144-148; and for *ṣippōr* in Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Gramm.* § 84, b, no. 24. Examples found in the several Aramaic dialects, including BAram., are: *'idd^{e}râ* 'threshing floor,' *'imm^{e}râ* 'sheep,' *ṣippărâ* 'bird'; also the borrowed *'eggar^{e}tâ* 'letter.' Other exx. from the Syriac are: *ḥess^{e}râ* 'little finger,' *sakk^{e}râ* 'shield' (Duval denies that it is Semitic), *šebb^{e}lâ* 'corn-ear,' etc. Now it is remarkable to find intensive formations in nouns of such primary significance as the above, for the organic reduplication of a radical has generally the economic purpose of intensifying the meaning, with the development of very precise functions for the various intensive formations.

The solution of the problem is found in the fact that in the nouns listed by the Aramaic grammarians all, with but few exceptions,[1] have for the third radical a liquid, *r* or *l.* The liquid, as it were, demands room for its articulation, and insists on holding the vowel before itself, or else introduces such an ancillary, anaptyctic, vowel, with the consequent doubling of the preceding consonant. If the stem is monosyllabic, the process is *'imr* > *immar*; if dissyllabic, *'imar* > *immar,* the doubling thus creating or holding the vowel required by the liquid. The process is parallel to the phenomenon represented by the so-called euphonic daghesh in Heb.,

[1] The only exceptions noted by Duval and Nöldeke are: *neggedâ* 'ship-puller,' *quppedâ* 'hedgehog' = Heb. *qippōd,* and so cf. Syr. *ṣeppĕrâ* = Heb. *ṣippōr.* The dental *d* may have had an effect similar to *l,* cf. Brockelmann, 1, p. 132, on occasional d > l. In the other lists the above nouns are grouped with true intensive formations, e. g. *taqqantâ* 'ordering.'

with the expression of a doubled consonant, e. g. *'in^{e}bê > inn^{e}bê, 'iq^{e}bê > 'iqq^{e}bê.*

A further process appears in the sporadic development of this short vowel into apparent length. Examples are *'immar* > Akk. *immêru* (*â* > *ê* by *'imâle*); **ṣupur* (or *ṣupr*) > *ṣuppur* > Heb. *ṣippōr* 'bird.' That the *o* in the latter case is not primarily long appears from the construct pl. *ṣippŏrê*, BAram. *ṣippărê*, and Syr. *ṣepp^{e}râ*. The same process appears in **šubul* > *šibbul* + *t* > Heb. *šibbōlet*, pl. *šibbŏlîm*. Cf. the similar development of Heb. *subbōlō* 'his burden,' from *subl*. (Barth's treatment of this form, § 74, c, is expansive but vague.)

A similar process is to be observed in a series of Heb. nouns,[2] e. g. *zikkārôn*, but const. *zikrôn* = BAram. *dikrôn; šibbārôn*, const. *šibrôn;* and so in cases where a liquid is the second radical: *gillāyôn*, const. *gilyôn; killāyôn*, const. *kilyôn; hêrāyôn*. These developments are not confined to cases of liquids, e. g. *ḥizzāyôn, piqqādôn;* but the explanation is found in the similar liquid character of *y*.

We can further compare the ancient variants in the pronunciation of the place name *'eqrôn* = ἀκ(κ)αρων, Akk. *amqarrûna*. The nasal dissimilation in the last form is quite common in the forms we have been discussing: Syr. *'edd^{e}râ* > Akk. *indiru* and Arab. *'indar;* Syr. *'emm^{e}râ* > Mand. *'embrâ;* Syr. *ḥeṣṣ^{e}râ* > Arab. *ḥinṣir; šubultu* (as above) > Arab. *sunbulat; ṣippôr* > *ṣinp^{e}ra* in Sachau's papyri.

This observation of the influence of a liquid upon its surroundings, which has been rather overlooked by the grammarians,[3]

---

[2] S. Barth, § 196; Brockelmann, 1, § 211, b, § 213, c, who cursorily recognize the doubling as secondary.

[3] Duval, § 114, d, notices the doubling of *l* in such forms as Syr. *'arpellâ, 'arṭellâi*, cf. Heb. *barzillai, karmillo*. In these cases the preceding vowel, which normally should be volatilized in Aram., is maintained by the liquid. I may add the Mandaic *hinilla* (in the Liturgy) from *hin-la* 'if not' (normally *ella*), with the development of a new vowel between the two liquids. The development is similar to that represented by the spelling of the French *merveille* in comparison with Eng. *marvel*. Also many Akk. nouns which because of their orthophonic spelling are placed in the intensive formations, certainly do not belong there, as comparison with the other Sem. languages shows; e. g. *gammalu* 'camel,' *bakkaru* 'young camel.' But Delitzsch has assigned these nouns to intensive formations, *Ass. Gramm.* § 65, no. 24.

throws light upon certain other forms. E. g. Heb. צַוָּאר[4] 'neck' = *ṣaw̆war*, is doubtless, as generally recognized, from *ṣaw̆r*, with, as in the cases noted above, the development of a new vowel and the consequent doubling of the preceding consonant, which doubling maintains itself through all forms of sing. and pl. The monosyllabic noun should normally give *ṣôr*, *ṣôrîm* (poss. *ṣᵉw̆ârîm*), *ṣôrê*. Also such a noun as *'aiyyāl* 'stag,' generally treated by grammarians as *qattal* (*ll. cc.* in the grammars) is doubtless *'aiyl* developed, according to the above theory, into *'aiyal*, with a thickening of the *i*, which is properly represented by the Massora with *'aiyyal* (cf. Arab. *saiyyid* for *saiyid*). Also in the interesting Heb. noun *sanw̆êrîm* 'blindness'[5] the penultimate vowel is long because of the *r*; that the process is sporadic appears from comparison with e. g. *'iw̆w̆ᵉrîm* 'the blind.' Also the long vowel in Syr. *pêrâ* 'fruit' is to be similarly explained.

In fine, the whole subject of the influence of liquids upon their surroundings, as also that of the distinction between primary, or organic, and secondary doubling (dependent upon phonetic circumstances), requires far more special attention than has been accorded them in the philologies. We are still too much obsessed by the conventional quantitative forms without first determining the phonetic bases.

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY.

University of Pennsylvania.

Note on the adaptation of a Chinese character to political change

Defiance of ancient tradition is finding expression in many aspects of Chinese life today. An interesting example is to be seen in two modifications of the form of the character *Kuo*[3], meaning, a state, a country.

---

[4] The unique spelling with ּ represents the new vowel provided with a *hemza*, i. e. *ṣaw̆war* pronounced as *ṣaw'ar*.

[5] The lexicographers have in general failed in the interpretation of this word. I find its correct derivation given only by Jastrow, *Dict. of the Talmuds*. It is a Safel form from root BRR (bright), i. e. *sabrar* 'dazzle' > *sabbar* > *sanw̆ar*. The peculiar labial *w̆* and the nasal dissimilation demonstrate the word's Akk.-Aram. origin.

Wieger[1] following the standard *Shuo-wen,* originally compiled by Hsü-shen, towards the year B. C. 200, traces the character as follows:—



"*Yü*[4]. A primitive appanage, a post, a centre; the — land that a landlord defended with 戈 the weapons of his men; 口 represents his residence, castle or town; the limits are not indicated, because there were none."

"*Kuo*[3]. An estate, well 口 defined and surrounded with marks, as they were later on; extended meaning, a state, a country."



(A singular collateral note is that which calls attention to the character *Po*[4] signifying anarchy or revolution. Wieger (*op. cit.*) says: "When the fiefs are upset; one character being straight up, the other upside down." One is reminded of the aptness of the ideogram during the present clash of North and South in China.)



From ancient times an alternative form for *Kuo*[3] has been used, especially in rapid writing, placing within the enclosure 口, not *Yü*[4] 或, the primitive appanage, but *Wang*[2] 王, a king. Of *Wang*[2], Wieger (*op. cit.*) says that in the character 王 one sees "the man 丨 who connects 三 heaven, earth and man." Obviously, 国 was an excellent picture for a kingdom, an empire.



With the coming in of the Republic, 国 was hardly a form that commended itself to thinking young leaders and everywhere one has been seeing the third form for this character. Here, within 口 the enclosure, one sees *Min*[2] 民, the people, the mass, the common multitude. The interpretation of this character is in doubt, but is perhaps "a plant with sprouts." The significance of the new form is at once apparent.



The fourth form for *Kuo*[3], the second of the two seen since the driving out of the Manchus in 1911, is scarcely in current use, but one runs across it here and there on signboards. It suggests the egotism of the new leaders and the selfishness which is so widespread in the land at present. In this form,

---

[1] Wieger, Dr. L., S. J.: *Chinese Characters,* transl. into English by L. Davrout, S. J.

within the enclosure 口, one sees *O*[2] or *Ngo*[2] 我. Wieger (*op. cit.*) defines this: "two 戈 lances in conflict, two rights that oppose one another, my right and by extension, my *Ego*, my own person; personal pronoun, I, me."

It is scarcely to be expected that this latter form will gain wide usage.

Yale in China, Changsha. EDWARD H. HUME.

Armenian hariur

According to Meillet, the origin of Armenian *hariur* (100) is unknown.[1] As Armenian has *ar* for vowel-*r*, we may assume that *hariur* came from a word-group **pr* **jur*. This word-group corresponds, in form and sense, to Turkish *bir jyz* (100).[2] Chuvash, which differs widely from other varieties of Turkish, regularly has *r* instead of *z*, and *p* instead of *b*.[3] A Chuvash-like dialect may have had **pr* = *bir*; and **jyr* = *jyz*, or even **jur* = *jyz*, for the palatal vowel of *jyz* can have come from *u* under the influence of the preceding palatal sound. We might suppose that **pr* < **br* represented a stressless form of *bir*; or that a general Turkish form **br* was in most dialects expanded to *bir*, parallel with Lithuanian *vilkas* < **wlkos*.

North Haven, Conn. EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

Sanskrit ṣṭhīv-

Sanskrit *ṣṭhīv-*, apparently connected with English *spew*, shows a remarkable change of the labial consonant. This change may have come from Dravidian influence, Dravidian equivalents being Kanara *tūp-*, Tamil *tupp-*, perhaps derived from a basis with initial *ṣṭ* or *st*.[1]

North Haven, Conn. EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

---

[1] Meillet, *Grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*, § 70 (Vienne, 1903).

[2] I use *j* and *y* with their Scandinavian values, in accordance with the International system.

[3] Gombocz, *Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache*, p. 202 (Helsinki, 1912).

[1] *A. J. Ph.*, vol. 40, p. 76.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

The Language of Education of the Philippine Islands. By NAJEEB MITRY SALEEBY, M. D., D. Sc. Manila, P. I., 1924. 53 pp.

In this pamphlet we have a statement and a suggested solution of a Philippine problem which must be solved in some way in the near future if the Philippine Islands are to develop and progress as they should. The problem is, briefly stated: What shall be the language of education in the Philippine Islands?

The author, whose connection with the Philippines dates back to 1900, and who has been a student of Philippine matters and a writer on Philippine subjects ever since that date, after giving some account of his Philippine activities in the *Preface,* states the present situation in the Islands, under the head of *Preliminary Remarks,* in the following way. There are three stages of education, viz., before, during, and after the period of school attendance. The language of all three should be and usually is in most countries the same. This is not the case in the Philippines, where we have no common native tongue, but only numerous local dialects. Here the language of the first and third periods is one or the other of the local dialects, that of the middle period was for three and a half centuries Spanish, and is now—since the Spanish-American War—English. Spanish attained no hold on the people during the long period of its use; it never became the language of the first and third periods. "Twenty-five years of intensive English education have produced no radical change" in the situation. English has made practically no headway against the local dialects in the first and third periods. There is no special reason why the United States should insist on using English as the language of education in the Islands unless it really serves the purpose for which it is intended. Therefore, a discussion as to what is the best language of education, the best language of the middle period, whether English or some other tongue, is most seasonable and appropriate.

This problem is then discussed under three heads, viz.,

(a) the suitability of English,
(b) the suitability of the vernacular dialects,
(c) the political questions involved in choosing one dialect in preference to another.

Under the first head, which he calls *The Present Policy* (pp. 11-32), the author points out that it was natural that English should have been chosen as the language of education after the expulsion of the Spaniards, as there was no national native tongue, and that it would have been a good thing for the Filipinos if English could have become their common educational and national language. This he asserts, however, in spite of the whole-hearted enthusiasm and faithful coöperation of the teaching body, has not been accomplished, and is indeed, under the conditions which prevail, impossible of accomplishment.

By a series of statistical tables the author emphasizes the following facts:

(1) The amount spent on education in the Philippines is proportionately as large as, or even larger than, that spent by the most progressive countries. The amount is raised by taxation in the Philippines themselves.

(2) To carry out the present program successfully two American English-speaking teachers to each school would be the minimum number required; but the number of American teachers, never sufficiently large, has now practically sunk to insignificance, there being in 1923 only 329 such teachers compared with 7668 schools and a school enrollment of 1,129,997.

(3) It would be impossible to attain the minimum number of American teachers above mentioned without a very large increase in the tax burden, and it is unreasonable to expect the Filipinos to increase their contribution for educational purposes far beyond the normal percentage contributed by enlightened peoples. Moreover, any increase in the number of American employees is opposed to the present policy of the Philippine government, which is apparently determined to Filipinize the whole çivil service.

(4) If English then is to become the common language of the Philippines, it must be made so thru the efforts of Filipino teachers, who constitute an overwhelming majority of the teachers in the Islands. Of 24,132 (misprinted 24,732 in text) Filipino teachers employed in 1923, almost half (10,000) had had no secondary education, only 3411 were graduates of normal or high schools, and only 246 were college graduates. If we consider that the efficiency of the college graduates as teachers of English is only

about 75% of that of American teachers, it is evident that the average efficiency of the teaching body as a whole in this respect is very low indeed, and that the view that the Filipino teachers, even with their natural ability, honest effort, and enthusiasm, are capable "of carrying English to the Filipino home, and of rendering it the common language of the people, is absolutely untenable."

(5) Only half the school population (i. e., children between six and sixteen years of age) receive any education at all; over 900,000 out of every million who go to school may be said to receive no secondary education, and about 85% get no education above the first four grades. The great majority, therefore, of school children, who constitute only half of the child population, are taught English only during the few years they are in school, and then by Filipino teachers who themselves have for the most part an inadequate knowledge of this language.

(6) English is not used by the natives except in school; in all intercourse with those who have not studied English in school (i. e., all of the older generation and about half the children) they are obliged, of course, to fall back upon the vernacular dialects. This difference between the language of the school and that of the home makes it difficult for the younger generation through their education to improve and uplift the social state of the older generation, in accordance with the expectations of the present educational program.

(7) The argument that English is better suited to foster democratic ideals, which is the chief argument put forward in defence of the present policy, is fallacious. No language that fails to touch the masses is fit for such a purpose.

(8) It would be impossible to establish English as the national language under the present system even if the teaching were especially good. If the Islands were colonized by one million Americans, then it might be possible, but with only about 6000 Americans, and with 12,000,000 Filipinos eager for national self-government, it is unreasonable, to say the least, to expect such a result.

(9) English, though not suited to become a national language, should be retained in the schools, and taught as the most important foreign language in all grades from the lowest to the highest.

Under the heading *Adaptability of the Vernacular* (pp. 33-41) the author proceeds to develop the second phase of his problem. He states that all the vernacular dialects of the Islands belong to the Malayan group (a subdivision of the Malayo-Polynesian or Indonesian family), and are sister languages of Malay and Javanese, and that while numerous, they are all closely related. He points out that, although the vernacular dialects have been practically ignored by the United States government (cf. my article, "The part played by the Publications of the United States Government in the development of Philippine linguistic studies," *JAOS* 42, pp. 147-170), they have continued to live and thrive, and there is a decided inclination among the Filipinos to have their children taught their native dialect in addition to English. As an example of the hold the vernacular dialects have maintained even on those whose instruction in English has been the most extensive, he quotes the letter of a high-school student of Zamboanga to show that outside of the class-room 99% of high-school students revert to their native idioms. As the high school graduates of any one year constitute only 1% of the annual quota of school population, according to this only 1% of 1% of the children of school age use English naturally in conversation.

The author admits that the vernacular dialects are not so highly developed in every respect as the languages of the civilized nations of Europe and America, but he thinks that the chief deficiency, which is that of vocabulary (scientific, technical, etc.), could be remedied by borrowing from another language which possesses the required terms. He believes that "all Malayan dialects derive their root words from an Indian stock which is closely related to the Sanskrit," and therefore suggests that Sanskrit should be employed as the source of such vocabulary. The facts, however, hardly appear to bear out this presumed relationship, and it would seem much more natural and convenient to use Spanish or English for that purpose.

The author acknowledges in the second place that there is no adequate vernacular literature which would make it possible to employ any of the vernacular dialects immediately as a language of instruction, but claims with perfect truth that this need could be readily supplied by having English texts translated into the vernacular dialects by competent educated Filipinos. This would,

he rightly asserts, be much easier than teaching thousands of Filipinos to teach English, and would result in an economy of time, effort, and money.

It is unreasonable therefore, he concludes, in the face of the facts here stated, to expect the Filipinos to abandon the use of the vernacular dialects in favor of English. "The Filipinos are entitled to a national literature, and to a national dialect that can give it natural form."

Under the caption *The Political Side of the Problem* (pp. 42-46) the author discusses the third phase of his problem, the feasibility and expediency of adopting some one of the vernacular dialects as the national language. His statements may be thus summarized. Of the 12,000,000 inhabitants of the Islands only 1,000,000 are non-Christians, and of these all except the Mohammedans (Sulus, Samals, Magindanaws) could easily be prevailed upon to use the dialect of their Christian neighbors. The chief dialects of the Christian Filipinos are about ten in number (Tagalog, Cebuan Bisaya, Panayan Bisaya, Samar Bisaya, Bikol, Iloko, Pampanga, Pangasinan, Ibanag, Zambal), and of these there are three (Tagalog, Cebuan Bisaya, Iloko) which so greatly exceed all the others in extent and importance, that it is not necessary to consider any other dialect as a candidate for the position of common or national vernacular. All of these are growing and expanding, and might be expected to take in the neighboring and most closely related dialects. Iloko will probably absorb the northern dialects Pangasinan, Ibanag, and the dialects of the pagan mountain tribes. Tagalog may be expected to extend its sphere over all central and southern Luzon (assimilating Pampanga, Zambal, Bikol), as well as over the islands to the southwest of Luzon, Mindoro, etc. Cebuan will doubtless swallow up the other Bisaya dialects, and become the speech of the whole Bisaya group and of a large part of Mindanaw (including the territory of the pagan tribes).

Of these three dialects Tagalog is to be preferred as a national tongue "both on theoretic and scientific grounds. Its linguistic preëminence and its relation to the national capital and to the Filipino heroes, supports this claim." If Tagalog had been declared the national language by the American authorities before 1907, the whole nation would long ago have acquiesced in the choice, and there would now be no national language problem. The choice of

Tagalog today for this position would be the ideal solution of the problem, and such a step is urged by real patriots and men of broad vision. If, however, local jealousies or political expediency make the choice of a single national language impossible, the field would have to be divided among the three chief dialects already mentioned, Tagalog, Cebuan Bisaya, and Iloko.

Having now completed his main argument, the author proceeds under *General Considerations* (pp. 47-52) to take up certain educational matters closely connected with the preceding. He points out that if the language of all educational agencies other than the schools, e. g., newspapers, periodicals, public libraries, popular literature, miscellaneous text-books, etc., were the vernacular, some educational facilities at least would be available for those who did not attend the schools, and an opportunity would be furnished those who had ended or completed their school course to broaden and deepen the education they had already acquired. With the use of the vernacular in all educational agencies, he thinks the educational classes created by the present system (viz., a small, intelligent, well-educated, English-speaking class; an unintelligent, partially literate class with a smattering of English; and the large, illiterate majority) would cease to exist. The first two classes would vanish and the third would tend to become literate and informed in a short space of time.

He emphasizes the fact that under present conditions there is no intelligent public opinion due to the lack of newspapers and newspaper readers, and implies that this condition would rapidly disappear with education and educational agencies conducted in the vernacular.

After giving a concrete illustration of how education in the vernacular would probably work out if applied in one of the Tagalog provinces, he devotes the last part of this section (pp. 51-52) to a brief statement in favor of education in the vernacular in the various parts of Asia and Africa under European control (India, Egypt, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine).

At the end of the pamphlet the author draws up his *Conclusions* (p. 53) under fifteen heads. The most important of these may be summarized in the following:

(1) English can never become the common national language.

(2) This should be one of the vernacular dialects, preferably Tagalog, though for this purpose three different vernaculars are preferable to one foreign language.
(3) The use of the vernacular would shorten the elementary course, make it possible for all children of school age to get an elementary education, and thus combat ignorance and abolish illiteracy among the common people.
(4) English should be taught as a second language in all schools, elementary and secondary.

We have in this pamphlet an exceptionally strong presentation of the case in favor of a vernacular national language for the Philippines. The wealth of argument which lay ready to the author's hand is perhaps responsible for the fact that in the heaping up of his points he does not always arrange them in the order in which they would have their greatest weight, and in his enthusiasm he at times appears to overlook the fact that the adoption of a "vernacular" as the language of education in a country of many "vernaculars" would not at once and entirely solve the educational problem, as it would for example in Egypt or Syria where there is practically only one native tongue. Nevertheless, assuming the correctness of the figures on which his arguments are based, and there is no reason to doubt their accuracy, Dr. Saleeby has certainly proved his main contentions.

English has not performed and can not perform successfully the functions of the educational and national language of the Philippines. The feasibility, moreover, of employing one or more of the vernacular dialects as a substitute for English is beyond question, and this being the case the advantage of having a single one of them is too obvious for discussion. That this language should preferably be Tagalog no unbiased person familiar with the linguistic situation in the Islands would hesitate to assert, but if it is found impossible to reach this ideal, the experience of Switzerland with its three official languages, German, French, and Italian, shows the possibility of having more than one national language.

A third possibility, which has several times been suggested, namely that of forming a national language by amalgamating or combining the chief dialects into a kind of Philippine *lingua franca* or Philippine *Esperanto,* Dr. Saleeby does not mention. The pro-

ject probably merits the silence with which he treats it, but the fact that some members of the Philippine Legislature take the plan seriously (evidence the bill for the forwarding of the project introduced by Senator Villanueva of Negros—see Philippine newspapers of Sept. 27, 1924) would seem to make it advisable to state at least the hopelessness of such an attempt. It would of course be perfectly possible to devise such a language, but it would probably be impossible to induce any considerable number of Filipinos to use it in speaking or writing, just as it has proved impossible so far to popularize the use of any artificial world-language such as Volapük or Esperanto. Besides, the only possible advantage of this plan, allowing that it were feasible, would be to save the local pride of the speakers of the various dialects, as none of them in this case would be called on to give way to any one of the others.

In adopting Tagalog as the national language it would not, it seems to me, be either necessary or advisable at present for the various parts of the Islands to give up entirely their native dialects. Outside of the Tagalog district some provision should be made in the educational scheme for the teaching of the local dialects in the schools alongside of Tagalog, for if the system is changed merely by substituting Tagalog for English, many of the same difficulties already noted as resulting from the exclusive use of English as the educational medium, though probably not so great in degree, would also manifest themselves here. Tagalog should of course be a part of the curriculum from the very beginning, but it would probably be better during the first year or so of the pupils' education for the instruction to be given in the local dialects. The language of instruction should be changed to Tagalog as soon as possible, in just which grade is a matter that would have to be determined by experience, but even after this change is made it would probably be found advisable to continue the use of the local dialect in some form through a considerable part if not through the whole of the elementary course. The system of elementary education would then be somewhat similar to that in use in the English-German schools in America before the World War, in which both English and German were used as media of instruction. There is no compelling reason, indeed, why the people of the various localities should not become practically bilingual, having a good command of both Tagalog and their local dialect, just as the Jews in many countries

are bilingual, speaking the German jargon called Yiddish as well as the language of the country in which they live.

It might be argued with some appearance of truth that the adoption of Tagalog as the language of education would perpetuate everywhere, except in the Tagalog region, the present unsatisfactory educational situation, the only difference being the substitution of one alien tongue, Tagalog, for another alien tongue, English; but the two cases are radically dissimilar. The success of Tagalog as a national language would be made exceedingly probable if not absolutely certain by the following advantages which it enjoys over English. It is a language of the same kind as all the other languages of the Archipelago with the same basic vocabulary; it is already the native tongue of over one-sixth of the population of the Islands; there are hundreds with a perfect command of Tagalog available as teachers of the language.

What would be the ultimate fate of the local dialects under the bilingual arrangement here suggested, would, of course, depend on circumstances, but the chances are that in the course of a few generations the superior advantages of the official national language would become so evident to all, and the knowledge of it so widely spread among the people of all sections and of all classes, that the local dialects would sink to a position of comparative unimportance, and that it might be then possible, without harm to the educational system and without serious objection in any quarter, to discontinue their use in elementary instruction.

In advocating and putting into effect a Tagalog program, the Tagalogs should bear in mind that the favored position of their language is due not so much to any superiority it possesses over the other dialects from a linguistic point of view, as to circumstances entirely independent of the field of language, such as the fact that it is spoken in the most important part of the Archipelago, that many of the most important popular leaders were and still are Tagalogs, and so on. As a matter of fact, reasons of this kind are the reasons that usually determine the choice of any national dialect: standard English is based on the East Midland dialect of the English court in which Chaucer wrote, standard French on the dialect of the region around Paris; the standard language of many peoples is the language of their Bible translation, e. g., Ancient Syriac, Modern German, etc. The Tagalogs should be proud that

they have been able to present their countrymen with a suitable national medium of communication, but this pride should not lead them to assume a contemptuous attitude towards the other dialects, any one of which under different circumstances might conceivably have been the strongest candidate for the position of national language. Every care should be exercised to avoid the wounding of local pride and local sensibilities.

On the other hand, the wise and patriotic thing for the Bisaya and Iloko leaders to do would be to come out whole-heartedly for a Tagalog program. None of them can sincerely question the fact that Tagalog is the language of the most important part of the Archipelago, the part most closely in contact with the outside civilized world, nor can any sincerely doubt that it would be easier to make Tagalog the national language than any other native idiom.

With regard to the teaching of English in the schools after the introduction of Tagalog as the language of instruction, I am inclined to differ with the author. It seems to me that the same objections which he raises to the use of English as the language of instruction still hold with regard to the study of English in the elementary schools under the new arrangement. If the large number of pupils who never receive any instruction beyond the elementary grades do not acquire enough English to be of any special value when English is not only taught, but is also the language of instruction for all subjects, how can they possibly obtain a satisfactory knowledge of that language when it becomes merely one of the subjects of the elementary curriculum? English in the Philippine schools should be relegated to the position of the most favored foreign language, like Latin, German, or French in America. It should not be begun until the latter years of the elementary course, but its study should be continued from this point until the end of the college course. This displacing of English from the early years of the elementary course would make room for the study of the local dialects referred to above.

The special political and educational problem created by the existence of Mohammedan tribes in Mindanaw and the Sulu Islands, while tacitly assumed by the author (cf. his statement, p. 42, "*with the exception of Sulus, Samals, and Magindanaws,* all non-Christians may be easily prevailed upon to use the dialect that their Christian neighbors use"), is not discussed. The problem is some-

what like that presented by Ulster in Ireland, and it is not impossible that its successful solution may follow in general the lines of the Irish settlement.

It is sincerely to be hoped that the Filipinos, in their agitation for instruction in the vernacular, will not stop short of the ideal course, the adoption of Tagalog as the sole national language, either with or without provision for the use of the other local dialects in the first years of the elementary course; and that their leaders will allow no question of political expediency and no pride in their local dialects to keep them from securing this best solution of their linguistic difficulties.

Johns Hopkins University. FRANK R. BLAKE.

Indische Erzähler. Eine Sammlung. Herausgegeben von JOHANNES HERTEL. Leipzig: H. HAESSEL.—Bände 1-3. *Die zehn Prinzen.* Ein indischer Roman von Dandin. Vollständig verdeutscht von JOHANNES HERTEL. Bände 1 and 2, Uebersetzung; Band 3, Anhang. 1922. 183, 209, 140 pp.—Band 4. *Indische Novellen I.* (Prinz Aghata. Die Abenteuer Ambadas.) Vollständig verdeutscht von CHARLOTTE KRAUSE. 1922. 208 pp.—Band 5. *Zwei indische Narrenbücher.* Vollständig verdeutscht von JOHANNES HERTEL. 1922. 223 pp.—Band 6. *Pantschākhjāna-Wārttika.* Eine Sammlung volkstümlicher Märchen und Schwänke. Vollständig verdeutscht von JOHANNES HERTEL. 1923. 209 pp.—Band 7. *Indische Märchenromane I.* (Kaufmann Tschampaka, von Dschinakīrti. Pāla und Gopāla, von Dschinakīrti. Ratnatschūda, von Dschnānasāgara.) Vollständig verdeutscht von JOHANNES HERTEL. 1922. 191 pp.—Band 9. *Zweiundneunzig Anekdoten und Schwänke aus dem modernen Indien.* Aus dem Persischen übersetzt von JOHANNES HERTEL. 1922. 93 pp.—Band 12. *Die wichtigsten Erzählungen vom Mahābhārata. Band I. Liebesgeschichten.* (Dewajānī. Schakuntalā. Ardschunas Verbannung.) Aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt von WALTER PORZIG. 1923. 160 pp.

Sächsische Forschungsinstitute in Leipzig. Forschungsinsitut für Indogermanstik. Indische Abteilung. Leipzig: MARKERT UND

PETTERS. Nr. 2. *Bharaṭakadvātriṃśikā.* The Thirty-two Bharaṭaka Stories. Edited, together with an introduction, variants, explanatory notes, and a glossary, by JOHANNES HERTEL. 1921. 55 pp.—Nr. 3. *The Panchākhyānavārttika.* Part I, containing the Text. Edited by JOHANNES HERTEL. 1922. 65 pp.

The volumes of *Indische Erzähler* listed above are of a widely varied character and equally varied importance. Primarily the series is intended for the popular reader, but at the same time the editor, Professor Hertel, has insisted upon attention to scholarship. It is doubtful if books containing as much of the philological, the scientific, as these do could find a large sale in the United States; it would be interesting to learn what success they have in Germany.

The first three volumes are devoted to the Daśakumāracarita, the "crest-jewel" of Sanskrit picaresque literature. Hertel apologizes for presenting a new German translaton of this work on the ground that the otherwise excellent rendering by J. J. Meyer (Lotus-Verlag, Leipzig, 1902) is phrased in unusual and awkward language, due to Meyer's effort to reproduce certain phenomena of Sanskrit diction. But for the scholar not much advance is represented by the new translation.

In the third volume Hertel presents critical work. Of this the most valuable is probably the index, which covers many subjects and seems exhaustive on them. Next in value is the discussion of the authenticity of the Pūrvapīṭhikā (introduction). Ever since Wilson first reported on the Daśakumāracarita this has been a point of disagreement; and the disagreement seems to have existed even before that time among the Hindus, for some native commentators ignore the introduction. Hertel believes that the introduction is *unecht.* He rejects Meyer's theory that it was composed by Daṇḍin during his youth, while the rest of the work was the product of his more mature mind. Hertel employs the old argument of the contradictions between the introduction and the main body of the work, and advances new ones based on inner evidence of a more subjective character. He claims that the *Geist* of the main work is that of *artha* or *nīti,* while that of the introduction is the *Geist* of *dharma;* and, again, that the introduction is totally without humor and satire, while these qualities appear in the main work in abun-

dance. Such argument, if substantiated, would be weighty, although not necessarily final, for Meyer's theory would provide for such intellectual development in Daṇḍin. But Hertel's evidence to support his proposition seems inadequate, the testimony insufficient; and his contention, like Meyer's theory, remains unproved. All he has accomplished is to show that there are differences of stylistic tendency. The question of the authenticity of the Pūrvapīṭhikā, although profitably agitated, is still unsettled.

The fourth volume of the series presents the translation of two Jaina *novelle,* or romances. Prince Aghata is Fortunatus; and the last part of the long and interesting series of Ambada's adventures establishes an interesting contact with the Vikrama cycle. Every one of these Jaina stories has a value not only as fiction but also as a source of information concerning Jainism. There is probably no more important phase of Indian literature being exploited at present than the Jaina *carita* texts. The Sanskrit texts of both these tales have been published in India, but the reviewer has not seen them. This volume has a number of critical and appreciative notes and a good index.

Volume five contains a translation of the celebrated, though hitherto unpublished, Bharaṭakadvātriṃśikā and of the "noodle stories" in Somadeva's Kathāsaritsāgara. The latter part is of but slight interest to the scholar, since Tawney's translation is already available; but Hertel has some further interesting material in his notes bearing upon his thesis advanced in 1912 that there was once an extensive collection of noodle stories, from which those in the Kathāsaritsāgara were derived. The Bharaṭakadvātriṃśikā seems to be shown by Hertel to be a Jaina satire directed against the Śāivas, although every effort has been made to remove all evidence of its purpose. In this respect it has a spiritual kinship with the Jesuit Beschie's *Guruparamattakathay.* Hertel endeavors to determine the author of the work and conjectures, with a fair degree of plausibility, that it is Munisundara, a contemporary of the Jaina monk Jinakīrti, two of whose works are translated in volume seven of the *Indische Erzähler.* The text of the Bharaṭakadvātriṃśikā has also been published by Hertel, being the next to the last item in the list above. It is based chiefly on a single MS, but also makes use of the fragments previously presented in print. No folklorist should neglect this collection. At the same time the

language is simple, although with some colloquial words, and would make good material for a beginner.

The Old Gujarati Pañcākhyānavārttika had already been reported by Hertel in his *Das Pañcatantra* (Leipzig, 1914) and the stories analyzed. He has now published a text (see the last item in the list above) and a translation (volume six of the *Indische Erzähler*). The language of the text is of great interest, as is bound to be the case with a dialect, practically untouched philologically, bearing so close a kinship to modern dialects on the one hand and the literary Prākrits on the other. It is to be hoped that Hertel will be able to accomplish his hope of publishing another fascicle, "containing a skeleton grammar, notes, and a vocabulary." The stories are also of interest, although other versions of most of them are well known. It is doubtful if they are *volkstümlich* to the degree that Hertel claims. In spite of the poor Sanskrit of the catch verses, the tales have a decidedly literary form, rather than one that is folk or oral. They have a different flavor from those in Temple's *Legends of the Panjab* or those in Stein and Grierson's *Hatim's Tales*. Instead of being oral tales that have advanced into writing, they seem to be literary stories that have declined into a somewhat less polished presentation. "*Rein volkstümlich*" seems a misstatement.

In volume eight appear three Jaina romances of the usual high quality. Hertel himself had previously edited and translated the text of Campaka (*ZDMG* 55, pp. 1 ff.) and of Pāla and Gopāla (*BKSGW* 69, 4). The text of the Ratnacūḍakathā was published by the Nirṇayasāgara Press in Bombay in 1917. The new translation improves upon the previous publication of the first two only in that it is a "verbesserte Auflage." For the translation of the third we are properly grateful.

The Persian anecdotes and jests of volume nine have been previously translated, as Hertel notes, most of them in Gladwin's *Persian Moonshee* (1801) and in G. Rosen's *Elementa Persica* (1843). Each of these two has stories missing in the other. The jests themselves, Mohammedan in their Indian presentation, are well known in the Orient and some have even penetrated to the United States. No. 73, for example, tells of a simple-minded soul who lost a donkey and then, surprisingly, gave thanks to God that he had not been on the donkey at the time it got lost. If he had

been, he would have been lost, too. A prominent Democrat, who had been mentioned for the nomination for President in 1924, though not nominated, told this rather feelingly after the election. The present edition is welcome both because it combines the two previous selections and because it makes accessible a collection that was no longer in print.

The *Liebesgeschichten* of volume twelve are episodes from the Mahābhārata, being the well-known tales of Yayāti (appearing here as the tale of Devayānī), Śakuntalā, and Arjuna's twelve-year exile after he had sinned by intruding upon the privacy of Yudhishthira and Drāupadī. In the appendixes are descriptive and textual notes.

Johns Hopkins University. W. NORMAN BROWN.

On the Literature of the Shvetāmbaras of Gujarat. By JOHANNES HERTEL. Sächsische Forschungsinstitute in Leipzig. Forschungsinstitut für Indogermanistik. Indische Abteilung. Leipzig: MARKERT UND PETTERS, 1922. 26 pp.

Professor Hertel gives first a brief resumé of the doctrines of Jainism and their influence on India, since Europeans—even scholars—are very incompletely informed in regard to Jainism. He then discusses the immense literary production of the Śvetāmbaras, of whose works 3200 are included in a catalog published by the Jain Śvetāmbar Conference in 1909. This catalog is by no means complete, as innumerable manuscripts, especially in the temple libraries, are not yet catalogued. These Jain works cover numerous subjects, including a very extensive narrative literature. These narratives have a religious purpose, as the hero usually receives initiation at the end, and resemble in form the Jātakas. Prof. Hertel compares the Buddhist and Jain styles at some length, to the advantage of the Jain, and comes to the conclusion that the Jains were the principal story-tellers of India during the middle ages and thereafter.

Two problems are involved in these narratives: the migration of stories, and the linguistic problem. The first one will be solved, Hertel thinks, by the publication of many works now hidden in Jain libraries. Treating the linguistic problem, he defends the Jains against the charge of using bad Sanskrit. The prevalence

of Sanskrit in Gujarat to a late period resulted in a colloquial Sanskrit with an admixture of Gujarātī which was used by the Gujarat authors, not because of their ignorance of the rules of grammar, but to appeal to a wider circle of readers. The author's contention is that "there is no such thing as standard Sanskrit," and that the Gujarātī Sanskrit has as much claim to good standing as any other. He rightly emphasizes the necessity of some acquaintance with Gujarātī for the study of Sanskrit written in Gujarat.

Prof. Hertel makes a plea for more critical editions, and dwells on the textual disfiguration of Indian manuscripts. In this respect he seems unduly pessimistic. Not all manuscripts are in the deplorable state he describes.

He concludes the brochure with a reference to the excellent work of Vijaya Dharma Sūri (now deceased) and his disciples.

HELEN M. JOHNSON.

Johns Hopkins University.

Classical Sanskrit Literature. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH. London: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, and Calcutta: ASSOCIATION PRESS, 1923. 153 pp.

This volume of the Heritage of India Series gives in a brief space a very admirable sketch of Classical Sanskrit literature up to 1200 A. D. The Veda and the Epics are not touched upon, and the Drama is omitted. The latter has since been treated in great detail by Keith in a separate volume published by the Oxford University Press in 1924.

The subjects discussed are the nature of Classical Sanskrit as a language, the Kāvyas including a discussion of Aśvaghoṣa and the predecessors of Kālidāsa, the prose romances and *campūs,* the popular tales, the didactic fables, lyrics and gnomic verse, and theories of poetry.

Strong arguments are advanced to prove the use of Sanskrit for secular literature in the pre-Christian period and to disprove the theory that Sanskrit was confined to those who sacrificed and engaged in theological speculations and that some primary Prākrit was first used for secular literature.

Brief mention is made of the literary value of early inscriptions and panegyrics.

Keith regards it as certain that Bhāsa is the author of the dramas published under his name and dates him before 300 A. D. The reviewer is not yet absolutely convinced that Bhāsa was really the author of the dramas ascribed to him. The evidence is not unequivocal.

This little volume is more than a popular sketch of the subject. It is a scholarly contribution which will be just as valuable to the specialist as to the layman.

WALTER E. CLARK.

University of Chicago.

Priyadarśikā, A Sanskrit Drama by Harsha. By G. K. NARIMAN, A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON and CHARLES J. OGDEN. New York: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1923. cxi + 137 pp.

The text, introduction and notes are the work of Jackson and Ogden. The translation is a revision of a translation made by Nariman.

The long and valuable introduction gives an account of the life and times of Harsha, a discussion of royal authors and patrons in India and especially of Harsha as an author and literary patron, the plot of the drama with a summary of time allusions and the duration of the action, the sources of the play, a discussion of the legend of Udayana, the relation between the Priyadarśikā and the other dramas of Harsha, the resemblance of the play to Kālidāsa's dramas and its position in Sanskrit literature, the language and style of the play and the method of constituting the text, the metres employed and a list of flowers and shrubs mentioned in the play. An appendix discusses the use of a play within a play on the Indian stage.

The text is given in Roman letters with translation on the opposite page. On the whole it is based on the Śrīrangam edition of Krishnamachariar with some readings taken from Gadre's text. The Prākrit however has been normalized on the whole to conform to rules set up by Pischel on the basis of the Prākrit grammarians. The reviewer is strongly opposed in principle to such normalization of the Prākrit passages in Sanskrit dramas. It seems to him

that the Prākrit should be based primarily on an exhaustive study of the manuscripts. Such a study however was beyond the scope of the present edition which lays chief emphasis on the translation, notes, and introduction, and prints a Sanskrit text only as a convenience to the reader who knows Sanskrit. Therefore the editors were obliged either to follow one of the uncritical Indian editions or to normalize the text.

About thirty-five pages of valuable explanatory notes are given at the end of the translation.

The play is a conventional Minor Heroic Drama without much originality. But it is a pleasing work marked by simplicity of style and skill in handling the incidents of the plot. This edition is admirably adapted to the needs of beginners who are just beginning to feel their way into the difficult field of Classical Sanskrit Literature. After their first year of Sanskrit in a Reader which has an admirable vocabulary and copious notes my students feel complete bewilderment when I throw them into an edition of some text printed in India, give them a big dictionary, and tell them to sink or swim. Such editions form a good bridge to more advanced work.

I regret that a Sanskrit *chāyā* of the Prākrit passages was not given. The book is intended for beginners rather than for advanced Sanskritists and since there is no good dictionary of Prākrit beginners are helpless before a Prākrit text. It seems to me that either a *chāyā* or a good vocabulary of the Prākrit passages ought to be given in all Western editions of Sanskrit dramas.

University of Chicago. WALTER E. CLARK.

Chinese Buddhism. By Professor LEWIS HODOUS, D. D., Kennedy School of Missions. New York: MACMILLAN, 1924. 104 pp.

This little volume, one of the trilogy of volumes on Buddhism planned for by the editors of "The World's Living Religions" series, does not pretend to be more than an introduction, but it counts among the few notable small books which have a value very far exceeding their size. The editors of the series are to be commended for presenting Buddhism not as a single whole, but in the Southern Asiatic, Japanese and Chinese forms that marked its

development under varying national conditions. For the volume on Buddhism in China they could not have chosen anyone better qualified, both by experience and sound scholarship, than Professor Hodous. Not a few writers on the world's religions have been limited to a knowledge of the sacred books of the religions they discuss. Although such knowledge is of unquestioned importance in a study of any religion, it is not in itself sufficient. One must have intimate and sympathetic understanding of the spiritual psychology of believers in the faith being studied. While well qualified in both respects Professor Hodous has gained an unusual insight into the religious thinking of Buddhists. He has given an interpretation of the Chinese form of Buddhism that is not to be matched in any other writing.

It is almost a pity that Professor Hodous did not retain in his title the term "Foism" which appeared in the preliminary announcement of the book. The term, although unfamiliar, would have helped to emphasize a point which is made clear throughout the volume, that Chinese Buddhism is distinctly an indigenous Chinese development of the Buddhist inspiration which came originally from without,

The volume has four characteristics of great value: First, it is written in a spirit of sober but sincere sympathy with the religious aspirations of Buddhism, and with the aim of interpreting what this faith means to those who believe in it. Second, it makes clear, with well-selected illustrations and critical analysis, the interpenetration of Buddhism into Chinese life, indicating the extent to which native Chinese attitudes were incorporated into the Buddhist system and given a distinctly Buddhist significance. While it is true, as was noted above, that Buddhism was definitely Sinicized and became a thoroughly indigenous Chinese religion, it is also true that many of the ethical, social and religious elements of Chinese thinking were 'Buddhaized.' Third, it shows the widening of horizon, enrichment of thinking and vitality of inspiration which came from Buddhism into Chinese life. The detailed analysis of this inspiration and its illustration in concrete instances are particularly well done.

Finally the book pictures clearly the important factors in "present-day Buddhism." Although this title is given to but one of the chapters, much of the material in other parts of the book

belongs to this topic. One may hope that Doctor Hodous will soon prepare out of the rich material that has been successfully condensed into the concise and vivid presentation of this small volume, a more extensive and detailed study of the whole subject. Growing out of the study of present-day Buddhism very happy suggestions are given for a more Christlike approach to Buddhists on the part of Christian workers; one in which the religious psychology and spiritual values of their own faith can be made use of as a help in understanding a faith which many believe will fulfil Buddhism just as it was intended to fulfil, and not destroy, the values of the Hebraism out of which it grew.

It is perhaps unfair to point out omissions in a work which definitely accepts very great limits of space. Three faults should be mentioned, however. First, a more complete statement should have been given of the process by which Buddhism was introduced into China and of its history within China. A great deal of fresh material is available from the expeditions into Central Asia led by Stein, von Le Coq and Pelliot. This material has not been drawn on to any great extent. A resumé of the history of Buddhist development in China might well have been added also. Some developments in Buddhism can only be understood in the light of the contests between Buddhism and the two Chinese systems, Taoism and Confucianism, with which it competed. The story of Chinese Buddhists who made pilgrimages to India, while familiar, might well have been repeated to emphasize the devotion to the faith which characterized the early converts. All this could have been given without greatly enlarging chapter two.

Secondly, I would note the failure to emphasize the elements in indigenous Chinese philosophical and religious thinking, particularly expressed in Taoism, which were similar to some important elements of Buddhism and formed a preparation for Buddhism. The doctrines of *Tao* which stressed harmony with nature, spontaneity and non-aggression, and a negative attitude toward the complexities of civilization are among the points that should have been brought out.

A third criticism to be noted is the lack of any treatment of the effect of Buddhist inspiration on literary and artistic development in China. To many Westerners Chinese art is the best known feature of Chinese culture. It would have been well to show the

relation of China's notable art movements to Buddhism. Esthetic and religious inspirations are often connected. The author does refer to the relation of *Fêng-shui.* He might well have brought out in this connection the extraordinary appreciation for nature which is illustrated by the charming locations in which all Buddhist temples are found.

One closes the book with the very earnest hope that Professor Hodous will soon prepare a fuller presentation of his material. One is particularly anxious to see the development which he will give to such suggestive ideas as the following: Buddhism as the essential religion of the Chinese; Buddhism as filled with significant social teaching; the Buddhist Purgatory as a warning and deterrent to unsocial acts, etc. One vivid statement is unforgettable. "What our Buddhist religion teaches us is: 'Let it pass!'" One would like to have a chapter on that text. And another on the delightful reference to the neighborly, serviceable wife of whom her Buddhist husband said, "Wife, I should think you would make a first-class Christian." Apparently the ideal of Martha, rather than that of Mary, has received too great emphasis in some forms of Christianity. One closes Professor Hodous's volume with new understanding of the religious experience of the Chinese as well as a new appreciation of the meaning of Buddhism.

LUCIUS C. PORTER.

Columbia University.

Japan und die Japaner. Von Dr. KARL HAUSHOFER. Leipzig & Berlin: B. G. TEUBNER, 1923. 166 pp.

It would be difficult to find within so small a compass as much digested and well arranged information as this booklet, with its eleven maps, its tables and its bibliography, contains. Dr. Haushofer of the University of Munich has written luminously of Japan in previous works, and now brings his mature views and statements very close to 1924. With German thoroughness, he looks first at the natural foundations and those great silent forces in earth and the universe which have moulded the body and influenced the minds of the most progressive race in Asia. After looking at the earth crust, oceanic environment, climate and living creatures on

land and sea and in the air, he tells us of government and religion. Then he passes on to the social organization and the gradual development from clan and tribe to the modern national parliament and the varied features and functions of the modern state. He gives one the impression, and a correct one, that Japan is not only one of the most closely knitted national structures, but also, considering its rather slender material resources, one of the most efficient in action and product. Yet while remarkably full in detail concerning the Japanese people and country in the proportions such as we formerly conceived them, the author deals very slightly with that tremendous problem which Japan has on her hands, viz., the government of what were her colonies, Korea, Formosa, etc.; but which are now integral parts of the imperial realm.

Not much space is given to the history which is now unfolding from that norm in the Mikado-centric theory and is making the nation more than throne or emperor. The maps help finely to aid the generalizations of the erudite author. One might almost wish that Dr. Haushofer could find the time and desire to follow, in a larger work, the illustrious example and the model of his predecessor Rein, whose work among serious books on Japan stands preëminent.

WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS.

Pulaski, N. Y.

Untersuchungen zum Hexateuchproblem, I Der Priesterkodex in der Genesis (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 38). By MAX LÖHR, D. Dr., Professor of Theology in the University of Königsberg i. Pr. Giessen: Verlag von ALFRED TÖPELMANN, 1924. 32 pp.

To any observant student it must be self-apparent that the scientific study of the literary origins and history of the Hexateuch is standing upon the threshold of a new era. The number of capable and authoritative scholars who feel the insufficiency and inconclusiveness of the so-called "Documentary Hypothesis" and its failure to answer satisfactorily all the many problems which it has raised, is growing steadily. It is a healthy and welcome sign, for it means that the next generation will surely witness a steady

and worthwhile advance in Biblical knowledge in all its wide ramifications.

The leaders in this movement thus far have been Wiener, Eerdmans, Sellin, Dahse and Smend. Now Löhr has added himself to the group. The general title of his latest work, *Untersuchungen zum Hexateuchproblem,* of which the booklet under review, *Der Priesterkodex in der Genesis,* is only the first, and presumably a very small, part, indicates the author's intention to extend his investigation over the whole Hexateuch. It might have been the part of moderation and propriety to await the completion of the entire work, before presenting this review, were it not that in this little pamphlet the author seems to have stated his main general conclusions with considerable fullness, seemingly in purposed anticipation of the eventually finished work, and almost as a challenge to fellow scholars in the Hexateuchal field to consider now and to pass judgment upon his conclusions.

The present booklet is small but compact and comprehensive. The author professes himself, both in his brief introduction and in the body of the work itself, an immediate and sympathetic follower of the Biblical scholars of the new school named above. His general thesis is that the "Documentary Hypothesis" is inadequate and untenable. In particular he claims that the advocates of this hypothesis have emphasized far beyond the bounds of scientific propriety the significance of stylistic analysis of the text of the Hexateuch and the conclusions with regard to documentary differentiations and literary history drawn therefrom. Unquestionably this is the weakest point in the method of the adherents of the "Documentary Hypothesis."

But having posited this negative premise, the author proceeds to advance certain positive hypotheses and conclusions of his own, as far-fetched, fanciful and unproved as can be. He contends, in the first place, that the entire theory of four main documents, J, E, D and P, is without foundation, that there never were such documents at all, and in particular, in consideration of this first field of his Hexateuchal research, no separate, independent Priestly Code of post-exilic composition. Instead, he endeavors to show that not a few fragments of those portions of Genesis which are usually assigned to the Priestly Code, notably 17, 6-8, the nucleus of 23 and the greater part of the creation-Sabbath story in 1 and

of the flood-story in 6-9, are of pre-exilic authorship. He makes these assertions either gratuitously or with proof so flimsy, illogical and unconvincing that even a beginning student must mistrust them.

Instead of these four main documents of the older school he maintains that there were numerous pre-exilic collections of legends (*Sagenkränze*) centering about the figures of the patriarchs, collections of ancient *Toroth,* and the like. These were woven together by Ezra in Babylon into one large, composite literary work, the *Torah.* This was brought by him to Palestine for the guidance, edification and enheartening of the restored Jewish community. The different stories or story-groups and the various, oft-repeated motifs and separate details found in them were designed by Ezra to establish or strengthen the people's faith in Yahwe, in His eventual salvation of them and in their ultimate triumph and dominion over their enemies, and to establish their rightful claim upon the land of Palestine, and the like. To this original compilation of Ezra there were innumerable later additions and insertions of varying character, purpose and age. Such, in brief, is the author's hypothesis of the literary origin and evolution of the Hexateuch, which, he seems to believe, his present little work has established conclusively.

Many of the details of literary analysis are keen and merit sympathetic consideration. This fact is acknowledged all the more gladly because it must be coupled with the regrettable judgment that beyond this the work possesses very little scientific merit. As a whole it is unconvincing and should be studied and used with extreme caution and reservation. The author's main conclusions are rash, gratuitous, unfounded and misleading. His method is far less reasonable and satisfactory and in conformity with the principles of true science than that of the older Documentary school. All in all, therefore, this little book does not represent any real advance in the domain of Biblical Science. The old, difficult problems still remain as troublesome as ever. The correct solution must lie in a different direction, a slower and more cautious procedure, and a more sober, reliable, and truly scientific method.

JULIAN MORGENSTERN.

Hebrew Union College.

Berossus und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur. Von PAUL SCHNABEL. Leipzig: B. G. TEUBNER, 1923. iv + 275 pp.

Orientalists of an earlier generation enjoyed one great advantage over those of the present; by necessity, they were forced to know their Greek and Latin classics. Today, so enormous is the mass of cuneiform tablets that little attention is paid by Assyriologists to the Greco-oriental writings; the one exception is Berossus, the Chaldaean priest and astrologer, from whom the later classical writers learned the most of what they knew of ancient Babylonia. Hitherto, we have been forced to depend on the collection of fragments in C. Müller's *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum,* ii, 495ff., but this edition, though a monument of learning in 1848, was made without reference to the cuneiform sources, and a new edition is welcome.

We turn at once to the fragments collected in the appendix. Our chief source is still Alexander Polyhistor, quoted direct or through Abydenus by Eusebius in his Chronicle, and this in turn is preserved through quotation of the original Greek by Syncellus or in Armenian translation. Schnabel may now use the newer translation of the latter given by Karst in the Berlin edition of the church fathers. In one respect, the earlier translations of Mai and Schoene were more usable, for translation into Latin demanded classical forms which correspond to the Armenian alphabet at the time it was adapted from the Greek, while Karst has employed the shifted values of the modern alphabet. The difficulty of turning proper names back into the Greek is obviated by Schnabel, so far as possible, by placing the Greek of Symmachus and the Armenian in parallel columns, but this does not avail where only the Armenian is preserved. A new witness to Eusebius is found in the Syrian Chronicle of Mar Michael.

The more important of the remaining historical extracts are taken from Josephus, of whom we now have the critical edition of Niese, and for the majority of the minor fragments we likewise have better editions. Schnabel has greatly increased the value of his book by carefully noting all variants. For the historical portions, there are a number of new fragments, from Helladius, quoted by Photius, from Hyginus, from Hippolytus, and one each added from Cicero's *Divination* and Pliny's *Natural History.* The well known reference to Gilgamesh by Aelian is of course included.

Hesychius once refers a Babylonian gloss to Berossus, from which Schnabel assumes that the entire list of twenty Babylonian words explained in the lexicon is from the same writer.

More important additions are to be found in the Astronomy, which Schnabel believes merely a part of the first book. He gives cogent reasons, yet it may be doubted if the influence of Berossus on later Greek astrology would have been so great had his astrology been contained in a rather dry work of ancient history. Schnabel excludes fragments 18 f. of Müller, from Stobaeus and Plutarch, but adds important extracts from Palchus, Cleomedes, Aetius, and an unknown commentator on Aratus. These are all attributed to Berossus by name; less surely, from content, fragments are found in Augustine, Pseudo-Epicurus, and Lucretius.

The greater part of the prolegomena was printed and separately issued in 1912. It has not been reset, and readers will save much time if they first note the substantial retractions in the brief "Berichtigungen." The personality, life, and work of Berossus is sketched as fully as our sources will permit, and then comes the main portion of the prolegomena, the study of the sources. Source investigation of lost authors is a quagmire whose safe traverse demands exceptional skill, and Schnabel has not always been successful, as witness his retractions. It is especially irritating to be half convinced by plausible theories as to Jewish or Christian literature, only to discover that the view is no longer held. Yet it would be quite unfair to give the impression that this work is futile. Students who exercise the requisite caution will find in these chapters a mine of information and a wealth of suggestion. Certainly no investigator of the fragmentary but highly important works in Greek which deal with the Orient can neglect these chapters.

Following chapters are less successful. That dealing with the cuneiform sources of the *Babyloniaca* is so brief that it might better have been omitted. Nor will much be gained by the chapter on chronology. In the reviewer's opinion, the attempt to extract exact chronology from Berossus is hopeless; when we have cuneiform sources, we may attempt to explain his chronological eccentricities, but not before.

"Babylonian astronomy in the time of Berossus," the last chapter, has little to do with our author, and is most forbidding in

appearance, for some pages seem taken from a handbook of the higher mathematics. Understanding is difficult without constant reference to the various works of Kugler and of Weidner. Nor does one feel much safer with the astronomers than with the source critics. What shall we do when a University of Pennsylvania tablet, supposed to be Kashshite, is dated by Weidner at about 1500 B. C. and by Kugler at 424 B. C.?

However, certain results of assured value are secured. Strabo, quoting probably Posidonius, names among the Babylonian mathematicians Kidinas and Naburianus. Undoubted fragments of the former have been found in the recently published work of Vettius Valens and in a new commentary on Ptolemy, and two other fragments seem proved by Schnabel, in Ptolemy himself, and in Geminus. We now find the same Kidinnu on Babylonian tablets, which present his tables. Other tablets use the tables of Naburimannu, that is, of Naburianus, and Schnabel has made it probable that the title cited by Hesychius as Mindaloessa stands for *mindatu sha shame,* which would be translated by *περὶ τὰ οὐράνια σύνταξις.*

Schnabel then calculates the dates at which the two systems were worked out, 427 B. C. for that of Nabu-rimannu, 314 B. C. for that of Kidinnu. The former was published in Greek in this year, the latter at first only in Babylonian. He then goes on to prove that Kidinnu discovered the tropic year and the precession of the equinoxes. If this is true, and Schnabel seems to have made out his case, then to Kidinnu goes the enormous credit of the discovery. Babylonia is once more the teacher of Greece in scientific matters, Hipparchus loses his chief claim to distinction and becomes a mere copyist, and Schnabel is justified in declaring that Kidinnu was the greatest astronomer of antiquity.

In his "Vorwort" Schnabel begs the critic to take the work as a whole, not in its parts. If we cannot exactly approve every point, we can heartily sympathize with his second plea, that to write the book he must combine in one classical philologist, Assyriologist, Old Testament student, chronologer, astronomer, historian of antiquity. His conclusion, that such work on the boundaries must always be ungrateful, we cannot accept. Schnabel has made an important contribution, and it will be appreciated.

University of Illinois. A. T. OLMSTEAD.

L'Islam et les races. P. J. ANDRÉ, Capitaine d'Infanterie Coloniale (Pierre Redan). Tome 1, Les origines, le tronc et la greffe; Tome 2, Les rameaux. Paris: PAUL GEUTHNER, 1922. xxvi + 270 + 325 pp.

La Syrie. Précis historique. H. LAMMENS, S. J. Beyrouth: IMPRIMERIE CATHOLIQUE, 1921. 2 vols. ix + 279 + 277 pp.

Le pèlerinage à la Mekke. Étude d'histoire religieuse. (Annales du Musée Guimet. Tome 33.) GAUDEFROY-DEMOMBYNES. Paris: PAUL GEUTHNER, 1923. viii+332 pp., 1 plate.

The political rehabilitation which has ensued to France from the Great War has been accompanied by an intellectual revival, shared in by other sciences, but, as the readers of the JOURNAL must have remarked, eminently by Orientalistic studies. The centennary of the Société Asiatique came at a happy moment when France not only was restored to her own in Europe but found herself enlarged as an Oriental power. It is of interest to note that of the Great Powers which had played the part of masters of the Near-Orient, which is almost synonymous with Islam, France alone has come out unimpeached in her holdings. To be sure, England has gained Palestine and established patronal rights over Arabia; but the latter has ever been a troublesome heritage to empire, while Palestine is politically valuable as a *pis aller* to Egypt, control over which England is fast losing. For it has become an autonomous kingdom, with reservation made only of the Suez Canal and foreign affairs. But how long these reservations will be respected remains to be seen. England has withdrawn her centre of gravity in North Africa to the Soudan, whence, if she cannot control the Delta, she can threaten the water supply of Egypt at its fountain head, and is building a great harbor on the Indian Ocean, Port Soudan, to counterbalance Alexandria. But these efforts do not escape the restless Egyptians. Spain has been driven to the seaboard of Morocco by the invincible Moors of the Riff. Italy is still busy in securing her fresh claims in Tripoli, in the rear of which are the Senoussi. Only France keeps her power intact and unimpeached in Algeria and Tunis; by her happy system of government these 'departments' of the Republic have remained untouched by 'the rising tides' of color and Islam, and have been a strength and not a weakness to *la Patrie.* To this secure footing

in Africa has been added by the post-war partitions the fair land of Syria, which French sentiment has claimed since the Crusades, and which despite the exclusion of the Holy Land, the real apple of the eye to the Frankish mind, has given France a coveted position in the Eastern Mediterranean, in its most beautiful and fertile territory, along with a back door into Mesopotamia. How secure this control is the censor, or else the lack of interest on part of American newsgatherers, does not permit us to learn. France had to retire from Cilicia in great precipitation, her claims in North Syria, involving the metropolis of Aleppo, are contested by the Turks, while 'Young Syrians' are politically restless in the Great Lebanon. The necessities of politics and the traditions of patriotism thus come in as incentives to the propagation of Oriental studies. The many excellent books in these lines now fast appearing from the French press are proof of this awakened interest and an earnest of a revival in French Orientalism which will make England and Germany look to their laurels.

The first of the titles registered above comes from the hand of one whose name is fresh in Oriental lore. M. Froidevaux, who writes the introduction, also introduces the author: "'Singulière audace et que n'aurait pas un vrai savant', pensera sans doute plus d'un lecteur"; and he continues, one might add "jeune présomptueux". But the qualifications of the writer he proceeds to expose. Captain André (who under the pseudonym Redan published a book on Cilicia in 1921, crowned by the French Geographical Society) is one of that type of practical scholarship which Europe in its political contacts with the Orient has known how to produce, whereas America in its seclusion has but professors and missionaries. A former student of the School of Living Oriental Languages at Paris, he had his apprenticeship, evidently as governmental agent, in the Sahara and Morocco, in the Red Sea and on the African shores of the Indian Ocean, and finally as French governor of a Cilician province. The author's purpose corresponds to his training: it is to inform his countrymen of the facts and the problems of Islam, on which he holds that his fellow-citizens are too little informed, as though with a natural provincialism they could not see beyond the Algerian frontiers. And so he would give a *coup d'œil* of the whole history, both extensively in time, and intensively as to values of Islam. The work does not appear to be founded at

firsthand on original sources; but who would be sufficient for such things in the wide fields of Arabic, Turkish and Mongolian learning? Yet he fulfils his purpose in giving a well proportioned and fluently written history. Modern Islam is his theme rather than the classical ages of the Orthodox Caliphs, the Omayyads, the Abbasids; and far more space proportionately is given to the Turco-Mongolian entrance into, and hegemony over, Islam, an obscure history on which we possess too little general information. Yet the importance of it cannot be too much insisted upon, for the student of the classical period is by no means qualified as an expert in modern Islam. In the second volume the various religious movements and schisms are studied, with a valuable chapter on the *Confréries,* and this is followed by appreciations of the forces of Islam in its different territories. All is treated from the standpoint of a very intelligent observer, one who is sympathetic without prejudice, withal no alarmist. Strangely enough M. André omits one region on which he might be particularly well informed, namely Syria. Have policies of state closed the gallant officer's mouth?

The second of the above titles is by one of the ranking Arabists of the world, Père Lammens, who has had an advantage over Western savants by his long life in the Orient. (It is learned that he has now left the University at Beirut to take up residence in the Jesuit College at Rome.) The work fills a long felt lacuna, that of a history of Syria by itself, by which term the author means practically the present French Syria, although Palestine is constantly included in his theme, especially for the age of the Crusades. We are so accustomed to the general method of history which studies Oriental history from the imperial capitals, from Mecca, Damascus, Bagdad, Cairo, Constantinople, that it is novel to have a history devoted consistently to one of the regions of that world. For every land lives its own life whatever may be the vicissitudes of empire, and while Biblical Palestine has been written up times without number, the Syria to the north has lacked its laureate. Père Lammens writes with a profound enthusiasm for his subject and a warm love for his adopted country. The great part of the book deals with the age since Mohammed. He is, as well known, a warm supporter of the Omayyad dynasty in his treatment of Islamic history, and he celebrates that dynasty as constituting a veritable Syrian *régime,* overthrown to the vast detriment of Syria

by the Abbasides, who removed the imperial capital from Damascus. His treatment of the age of the Crusades is full and interesting; from the Frankish point of view, to be sure, but his positions must be respected as he is as much at home in the Arabic as the European sources. The intricate history of the Lebanon in the subsequent ages is given with great precision. And the conclusion of the book, with its survey of the Allied campaigns in Palestine and Syria and the results, is of value and interest as giving another view of the military and political problems involved than that which we gain from English publications. He takes a very depreciatory view of the part played by the Arabs in the *débacle* of the Turkish empire and of Colonel Lawrence's relations with these untamed allies. May other similar regional histories of the Mediterranean world follow suit to this informing volume.

The third of the above volumes is an archaeological study of 'the Pilgrimage to Mecca'. Proper appreciation of this learned work must be left to the skilled Arabist. With remarkable fulness and keen criticism the author discusses all the pertinent historical allusions and innumerable and conflicting *ḥadîths*. Nowhere else can such an assemblage of facts be found. His deductions are given cautiously, he has no theory of *Religionsgeschichte* to establish. But apart from its authority for the Arabist, the work is full of meat for the student of the history of religions, and must become a text book for the one desirous to pursue the survivals of antique religion in Islam; and the writer's cross references and interest in the larger field will serve the reader. One small gleaning may be noted. On p. 292 he notes that the *ḥalk*, the shearing of the head at the end of the pilgrimage, is not permitted to women, only a symbolic cutting of a short stretch of the hair, the reason given being that the hair is one of the attractions of a woman, and that she may not dispose of it, if married without the authorization of her husband, if a slave, of her master. This may throw light upon the vexed passage in I Cor. 11, 10: 'a woman should have a *power* (ἐξουσίαν) upon her head', or a sign of power, as generally interpreted. Had St. Paul in mind rules of Jewish praxis similar to those of Arabia which gave the husband control over his wife's hair and which obviated the customary shearing after vows (cf. Acts 21, 24)? The value of the book would have been increased by a map of Mecca and its environs, and, to the American eye, by photographs, which are now easily procurable.

University of Pennsylvania. J. A. Montgomery.

Al-muḳtaṭaf and its Press.

Al-badâ'i' wat-ṭarâ'if. By JIBRAN JALIL JIBRAN. Cairo: Press of JOSEPH KAWWY, 1923.

The JOURNAL exchanges with *Al-muḳtaṭaf,* an "Arabic Monthly Review," as it entitles itself in a sub-title. It is edited by MM. Ya'ḳûb Ṣarrûf and Fâris Nimr, who conduct the well-known press of the journal named. *Al-muḳtaṭaf* appears monthly, in handsome form as to type and get-up, and fulfils, as it professes, the function of a monthly magazine covering all the domains of cultured interest, from *belles-lettres* to science. The reviewer remarks with pleasure the attractive character of the contents, which contain many titles of real interest and originality. Archæological subjects are included, such as the recent excavations in the Valley of the Kings, and at Jubail, and the numerous illustrations are of excellent quality. It might be well for some superficial people of political bent who take lightly "the Arabs" as if they were still barbarians, to be imposed upon by Christians and Jews in their political aspirations, to glance at these pages. To be sure they largely represent Western culture, but the composition is in the classical Arabic, which here shows how it is still able, as ever in the past, to be the purveyor of exotic sciences and yet to maintain its integrity as a language. And a great language is itself an education to a people. The Press of *Al-muḳtaṭaf* also issues numerous volumes as supplements to the journal, some of which have come to hand. We note *basâ'iṭ 'ala l-falak,* "Text-book of Astronomy," by the senior member of the firm, well illustrated with plates of the heavens, and containing an index of the technical astronomical terms with their Western equivalents, which may well be of use to Western scholars. Another title, *Fatât Miṣr,* "A Girl of Egypt," by the same writer, is a very attractive romance of high life in Cairo and cosmopolitan circles, set in a number of different scenes, ranging from London to Tokyo, at the time of the Russian-Japanese War. The theme is of the love between an English gentleman and a Coptic maiden of high degree, and the story gives scope to the discussions of war, of "Big Finance," etc. To the Western reader the glimpses into the inner life of Cairo are most interesting, and he might wish that the subject had been confined to the native field without the cosmopolitan excursions. The story is simple and charming, and quite as good as hosts of the current

society novels in English. The *Kitâb sirr an-najâḥ* ("Secret of Success") is a fourth edition (1922) of Dr. Cornelius Van Dyck's translation of Samuel Smiles's famous book, "Self-Help," the first edition of the translation having appeared in Beirut in 1880. The evident demand for this stimulating book, which profoundly impressed its generation, is creditable to the reading public in the Arab-speaking world.

The author of the second title ("Novelties and Oddities") in the heading, M. Jibrân Jalîl Jibrân, is a distinguished literateur of Libanese birth, and withal an artist of recognized merit, who has studied in Paris, and who, we understand, has taken up residence in New York. The volume is adorned with his sketches, and contains many imaginative and philosophizing pieces, of thoughtful and pleasing sentiment. Why should not our Western seminars encourage the reading of modern Arabic literature? Their Arabism is surely good enough for the taste of most students, and they give an insight into the modern mind of that literature, which may help heal the breach between "East and West" on which Dr. Adler discoursed in his recent Presidential address. Also the philologist will find crumbs of interest in this wonderfully rich language which no dictionary has ever exhausted. The reviewer notes, for example, the Libanese use of the word *haikal* used of a country mansion (as he had similarly observed its use in Aramaic incantation texts), of course merely a degeneration of the word until it comes to mean any "big house." In the romance named above a term used in a certain tense situation puzzled the reader, viz. *musaddas*. At last the context showed that it meant a "six-shooter." The use of the II. Form pass. ppl. corresponds exactly to *mešullaš*, used of the three-year-old cow in Gen. 15^9. It might be remarked in conclusion that these books and journals are deposited in the Library of the Society at Yale University.

J. A. Montgomery.

University of Pennsylvania.

MINOR NOTICES

Jaina Jātakas or Lord Ṛshabha's Pūrvabhavas. Being an English Translation of Book I Canto I of Hemacandra's Trishashṭiśalākāpurushacaritra. Originally translated by Prof. AMŪLYACHARAN VIDYĀBHUSHANA. Revised and edited with notes and introduction by Prof. BANARSI DAS JAIN. [Punjab Sanskrit Series, No. 8.] Lahore: PUNJAB SANSKRIT BOOK DEPOT, 1925. xxiv + 118 pp.

The previous births of the first Jina, as told by Hemacandra; the original text of Haribhadra's shorter version is also given in the introduction. The text is interesting at many points. E. g., vss. 287-394 present a fourfold debate between a Jain, a materialist, a Buddhist, and a Vedāntin. The translation is only fair, and the notes insufficient; many Jain technicalities, including some very obscure ones, are left unexplained. Naive are the renderings of *kva . . . kva* (752) by "where . . where," and of *anyedyuḥ* (632) by "the other day," instead of "one day" or at most "the next day." In 455 "having pardoned his relatives" is equally bad grammar and sense; *kṣamayitvā* (causative!) means "having asked forgiveness of, *caused* to pardon (for leaving)" and so "having said good-by to," see *JAOS* 44, p. 160. It seems to be a Jainistic expression. The list of new words, pp. vi ff., is incomplete; e. g. it omits *paryāya,* 169, apparently "life," and *śivaśrī,* 1, rendered "final beatitude." Misprints are all too numerous. There is a useful index.

History of the Nayaks of Madura. By R. SATHYANATHA AIYAR. Edited . . . by S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR. London, etc.: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1924. xv + 403 pp.

A competent history of Madura, a dependency of the kingdom of Vijayanagar in South India (16th-18th centuries), based on the original sources, native and European. Some of the sources (e. g. Jesuit letters) are quoted in Appendices. There is a chronological list of inscriptions, a bibliography, and an index.

The Early History of Bengal. By F. J. MONAHAN. London, etc.: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1925. xii + 248 pp.

The book is really nothing but a description of the Maurya empire, based on the Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra, Greek evidence, and Aśoka's inscriptions. All this has been discussed so often before that the author can not add much, tho his treatment is intelligent

and well-informed. The misleading title is thus explained: the author intended this as the first volume of a monumental History of Bengal, and since there are no materials specifically dealing with Bengal in pre-Christian times, he took the Maurya empire (the capital of which was at least near Bengal) as a starting-point, assuming that social conditions in Bengal must have been much the same. He died before this volume was printed.

The Vision of Vāsavadattā. (*Svapnavāsavadattam.*) With stanzas attributed to Bhāsa in various anthologies and extracts bearing on the legend of Udayana from the *Ślokasaṃgraha* of Buddhasvāmin, the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* of Kṣemendra, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva. Edited with an Introduction, English Translation . . . (etc.). By LAKSHMAN SARUP. Lahore: DAS BROTHERS, n. d. [1925.] x + 77 + 86 + 142 pp.

A hitherto unused MS. was collated for the text, but contributed almost no important variants. Bhāsa's authorship is defended, without new arguments of value. The translation is not successful from the artistic standpoint.

Indo-Européens et Indo-Iraniens. L'Inde jusque vers 300 av. J.-C. Par L. DE LA VALLÉE-POUSSIN. [Histoire du Monde. Publiée sous la direction de M. E. CAVAIGNAC. Tome III.] Paris: E. DE BOCCARD, 1924. 345 pp.

The first hundred pages are devoted to the "Indo-Europeans and Indo-Iranians" outside of India. Then come chapters on the ethnography of India, on "castes and classes," on "the history of the Aryan languages of India," on the scattered fragments of early Indian "history" ("faits historiques ou semi-historiques" as the author cautiously says), and finally on beliefs and speculations from the Veda to Buddhism, including the (early) *bhakti*-religions. The author modestly disclaims the right to speak with authority on most of these fields. But, if the book contains few new facts (how could it contain many?), the points of view presented are always intelligent and independently critical.

Padmapurāṇa and Kālidāsa. By H. ŚARMĀ, M. A. Calcutta: R. N. SEAL, 1925.

This work contains a critical edition of the parts of the Padma Purāṇa (Bengal recension) which correspond to Kālidāsa's Śakuntalā and Raghuvaṅśa. The introduction tries to prove that these passages were the sources of Kālidāsa's play and poem. In a Fore-

word, Professor Winternitz (under whose guidance the work was started) expresses his belief that the author has "proved his case and made [this theory] highly probable." With all deference to such high authority, the reviewer remains unconvinced. Especially as regards the Śakuntalā story, the proofs seem extremely weak. Only seven "verbal correspondences" (some none too close) are adduced; and it seems that all of them might easily be accidental. The author's negative conclusions that the Mahābhārata was not Kālidāsa's source, and that the Padma Purāṇa is not based on Kālidāsa, are more convincing. But it is not at all necessary to assume any direct connection between different versions of this ancient and wide-spread Indian story.

The Atharva-Prātiśākhyam or the Phonetico-grammatical Aphorisms of the Atharva-Veda. Critically edited for the first time . . . by VISHVA BANDHU VIDYĀRTHĪ ŚĀSTRĪ. Part I. Lahore: PANJAB UNIVERSITY, 1923. 80 pp.

This is not the text edited years ago by Whitney in this JOURNAL, but another text which the editor believes is the true AV. Prātiśākhya. A second part of the work will elucidate the text and discuss its relation to Whitney's text (the "Caturadhyāyikā"), and the relations of both to the two recensions of the AV. Saṁhitā. A third part will give a new edition of the Caturadhyāyikā. Whatever these relations may prove to be, there is no doubt of the value of the text here presented, nor of the editor's learning and competence.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

The Executive Committee by unanimous vote has elected the following to membership in the Society:

Prof. Augustus W. Ahl	Mr. Chang S-Lin
Prof. F. W. Buckler	Dr. George B. McFarland
Miss Cecilia Cutts	Rev. Dr. Hilary G. Richardson
Dr. Georges Dossin	Rev. H. Henry Spoer
Prof. Moses Jung	Mr. Wesley F. Taylor

NOTES OF OTHER SOCIETIES, ETC.

Yale University announces the establishment of a number of Fellowships for Research in the Humanistic Studies and the Natural Sciences, endowed by a gift of One Million Dollars from the estate of John W. Sterling. "Research or Senior Fellowships" on this foundation, the holders of which must have the Ph. D. degree or equivalent training, will pay $1,000 to $2,500. "Junior Fellowships," for persons "well advanced" towards the doctorate, will pay $1,000 to $1,500.

A LIST OF THE DIVINE AND DEMONIC EPITHETS IN THE AVESTA

LOUIS H. GRAY

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

A LIST of the Avestan epithets of divine and demonic beings is of value in view of the assistance often derived from such terms in ascertaining the nature and functions of the deities and demons.[1] The list here presented consists of two parts, arranged in the conventional order of the Avestan alphabet: (*a*) each epithet applied to a divine or demonic being with full reference to the passage or passages in which it occurs; and (*b*) each divine or demonic being, both separately and in all his groupings, with every epithet given to him.

The following abbreviations are here employed: *Āfr.* = *Āfrīnakān; Aog.* = *Aogəmadaēča; AZ.* = *Āfrīn-ī-Zaratūšt; FW.* = *Westergaard Fragments; G.* = *Gāsānbār; HY.* = *Haδōxt Yašt; Nīr.* = *Nīrangastān; Ny.* = *Nyāyišn; Phl. tr.* = *Pahlavi translation; RV.* = *Ṛg-Veda; Sīr.* = *Sī Rōčak; Vd.* = *Vīdēvdāt; Vsp.* = *Vīsprat: VY.* = *Vīštāsp Yašt; Ys.* = *Yasna; Yt.* = *Yašt.*

EPITHETS.

[References in italics are to the Gāθās; in black-faced type to the Haptaŋhāitī.]

aoxtō-nāman-, "whose name is spoken":

Ātar: Ys. iii, 21; vii, 21; Vsp. ix, 5.

Miθra: Ys. i, 3; ii, 3; iii, 5; iv, 8; vi, 2; vii, 5; xvii, 2; xxii, 5; lix, 2; Ny. ii, 10; G. i, 2, 8, 10; Sīr. i, 16.

Vanant: Yt. xxi, 1.

Sraoša: Ys. iii, 20; vii, 20.

aojah-, "strong":

Miθra: Yt. x, 140.

---

[1] Cf. C. F. H. Bruchmann, *Epitheta deorum quae apud poetas graecos leguntur*, Leipzig, 1893; J. B. Carter, *De deorum romanorum cognominibus quaestiones selectae*, Leipzig, 1898; see also G. Dottin, *Manuel pour servir à l'étude de l'antiquité celtique*, 2d ed., Paris, 1915, pp. 304-309; and, for the principle in general, H. Usener, *Götternamen, Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung*, Bonn, 1896, pp. 216-247.

aoǰahvant-, "possessing strength":
Ātar: Ys. *xxxiv, 4.*
Xšaθrya: Ys. *xxxi, 4.*
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 32.
Sraoša: Ys. lvii, 11.
(*ójasvant-* is used of Indra in RV VIII, lxv, 5.)

aoǰin-, "strong":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 46 (47 names).

aoǰiš-, "strength":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 46 (47 names).

aoǰišta-, "most strong":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 75.
(*ójiṣṭha-* is used of Indra in RV I, cxxix, 10; VIII, lxxxii, 8; lxxxvi, 10; X, lxxiii, 1.)

aka-, "evil":
Druǰ: Yt. xix, 95.

akarana-, "boundless":
Zrvan: Ys. lxxii, 10; Ny. i, 8; Sīr. i, 21; ii, 21; Vd. xix, 9, 13, 16; VY 24.

aγa-daēna-, "possessing a wicked religion":
Dahāka: AZ 3.

aγrya-, "foremost":
Miθra: Yt. x, 140.
(*agriyá-* is used of Tvaṣṭṛ in RV I, xiii, 10; of Vāyu in VIII, xxvi, 25.)

aiθyaǰah-, "unimperilled":
Amәša Spәntas: Ys. xxvi, 3; Yt. xiii, 82; xix, 15.
Ahura-Miθra: Ys. i, 11; ii, 11; iii, 13; iv, 16; vi, 10; vii, 13; xvii, 10; xxii, 13; Ny. ii, 12; Yt. x, 145.

aδaoya-, "undeceivable":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. xii, 1.
Miθra: Yt. x, 82.
(Cf. *ádabdha-* as used of Varuṇa in RV I, xxiv, 13; IX, lxxvii, 5 [of the eye of Mitra-Varuṇa in VI, li, 1]; of Agni in I, lxxvi, 2; II, ix, 6; IV, iv, 3; VI, vii, 7; VIII, xliv, 20; X, cxxviii, 6; of Indra in VIII, lxvii, 6; of the Aśvins in III, liv, 16; of the Ādityas in II, xxvii, 3, 9; xxviii, 3; VII, lx, 5; VIII, xviii, 2; lvi, 13.)

aδaoyamna-, "undeceivable":
Miθra: Yt. x, 24. 27, 31, 46, 60, 61, 69, 82, 141, 143.

aδaoyo-xratu-, "possessing undeceivable wisdom":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. xii, 1.

aδairi-dahyu-, "(dwelling) beneath the country":
Miθra: Ny. ii, 11; Yt. x, 144.

aδavi-, "undeceiving":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 14 (74 names).

anaγra-, "beginningless":
Raoč̊ā: Ys. i, 16; iii, 18; iv, 21; vii, 18; xvi, 6; xxii, 18; lxxi, 9; G. iii, 6; Yt. xii, 35; Sīr. i, 30; ii, 30; Vd. xi, 1, 2, 10, 13; xix, 35; HY ii, 15; VY 61.

anaiwi-druxta-, "undeceived":
Miθra: Ny. ii, 14; Yt. x, 5, 23.

anamarəždika-, "pitiless":
Vaya: Aog. 77, 78, 79, 80, 81.

anāxrviδa-dōiθra-, "whose eye is not ?":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 54.

anā-mąθwa-, "unwaylayable":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 32.

anāhita-, "undefiled":
Miθra: Yt. x, 88.
Haoma: Yt. x, 88.
(The term is one of the standing epithets of the amnestonymous goddess known as Arədvi Sūra Anāhita.)

antarə-dahyu-, "(dwelling) within the country":
Miθra: Ny. ii, 11; Yt. x, 144.

apayata(r?)-, "fetcher":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 43 (47 names).

apairi-āya-, "uncircumventable":
Astō-vīδōtu: Aog. 57.

aipičara(r?)-, "aftergoer":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 45 (47 names).

aipi-dahyu-, "(dwelling) behind the country":
Miθra: Ny. ii, 11; Yt. x, 144.

aipiδbaoγa-, "aftergoer":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 45 (47 names).

afnahvant-, "rich in possessions":
Māh: Ny. iii, 7; Yt. vii, 5.

afščiθra-, "containing the seed of water":
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 4.

abaxha-, "without bhang":
Ahura Mazda: Vd. xix, 20.

aibigāya-, "?":
Aiwisrūθrima: Ys. i, 6, 20; ii, 6; iii, 8; iv, 11; vi, 5; vii, 8; xvii, 5; xxii, 8; G. iv, 1, 5.

aiwiθūra-, "victorious round about";
Fravašis: Ys. iv, 6; vii, 22; xxiii, 4; xxiv, 33; lxv, 12, 13; Vsp. xi, 15; Yt. xiii, 1, 40, 75, 156, 158; Sīr. i, 19, 30.
Miθra: Ny. ii, 14; Yt. x, 5, 78.

aiwi-dahyu-, "(dwelling) round about the country":
Miθra: Ny. ii, 11; Yt. x, 144.

aiwi-xᵛarənah-, "possessing glory round about":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 48 (47 names).

aiwyāma-, "possessing might round about":
Aməša Spəntas: Ys. xxvi, 3; Yt. xiii, 82; xix, 15.
amavant-, "mighty":
"Aredvī": Ys. lxv. 3; Yt. v, 15.
Aši: Ys. ii, 14; vi, 13; xvii, 14; Vsp. ix, 4; Yt. xvii, 1, 7; Sīr. ii, 25.
Ātar: Ys. *xxxiv, 4.*
Uparatāt: Vsp. ix, 4.
Ərəti: Vsp. ix, 4.
Čišti: Vsp. ix, 4.
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 4.
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 2.
Paurvatāt: Vsp. ix, 4.
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 29.
Miθra: Ny. ii, 15; Yt. x, 6, 25, 105, 107, 112; Sīr. ii, 25.
Yazatas: Vsp. ix, 4.
Rašnu: Yt. x, 100; xii, 5, 6; xvii, 16.
Vanant: Yt. xxi, 1.
Vərəθraγna: Yt. xiv, 59.
Sraoša: Vsp. xv, 3.
(*ámavant-* is used of the Maruts in RV I, xxxviii, 7.)
amiθwa-, "incomparable":
Miθra: Yt. x, 140.
aməša-, "immortal":
Hvarə: Ys. 0, 9; xxii, 24; Ny. i, 10, 17; Yt. vi, 7; x, 13; Sīr. i, 11.
ayō-xaoδa-, "possessing metal helmets":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 45.
ayō-vərəθra-, "possessing metal shields":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 45.
ayō-zaya-, "possessing metal weapons":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 45.
airime-aŋhaδ-, "sitting quietly":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 73.
auruša-, "white":
Miθra: Yt. viii, 2.
(*aruṣá-* is used of Agni in RV III, i, 4; xv, 3; xxxi, 3; V, i, 5; VI, iii, 6; X, i, 6; etc.; of Soma in IX, xxv, 5; lxxii, 1.)
aurušāspa-, "possessing white horses":
Miθra: Yt. x, 102.
arətō-karəθna-, "possessing fulfilment of (religious) duty":
Hamaspaθmaēdaya: Vsp. i, 2; ii, 2.
arədra-, "true":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 32, 75.
Miθra: Yt. x, 65.
arənaṭ-čaēša-, "?":
Miθra: Yt. x, 35.
aurva-, "swift":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 46 (47 names), 54, 57.
Haoma: Ys. x, 4.

aurvaṭ-aspa-, "possessing swift horses":
Apąm Napāt: Ys. ii, 5; vi, 4; xvii, 4; lxv, 12; lxx, 6; G. iii, 8; Yt. ii, 9; v, 72; xix, 51, 52; Sīr. ii, 7, 30.
Hvarə: Ys. 0, 9; i, 11; iii, 13; iv, 16; vii, 13; xvi, 4; xxii, 13, 24; xxv, 4; lxviii, 22; Ny. i, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, 19; ii, 9; Yt. vi, 0, 1, 4, 6, 7; x, 13, 90; xii, 34; xiii, 81; Sīr. i, 11; ii, 11; Vd. xxi, 5; AZ 6.

aurvant-, "swift":
"Arədvī": Yt. v, 7.
Haoma: Ys. x, 10.
(*árvant-* is used of Agni in RV VI, xii, 6; of Indra in VI, xxxvi, 2; of the Viśve Devāḥ in X, lxiv, 6.)

arvōtəma-, "swiftest":
Vayu, Yt. xv, 46 (47 names).

aršan-, "virile":
Apąm Napāt: Yt. xix, 52.

aršō-kara-, "?":
Vərəθraγna: Yt. xiv, 28.

aršdāta-, "rightly created":
Haoma: Ys. ix, 16.

arš-ṭkaēša-, "orthodox":
Rašnu: AZ 7.

arš-vačah-, "possessing right words":
Miθra: Ny. i, 6; Yt. x, 7.

arəzayant-, "battling":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 33.

ava-tanuya-, "?":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 7 (74 names).

avanəmna-, "unconquered":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 8 (74 names).

avi-ama-, "exceeding strong":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 35.

asəngō-gav-, "stone-handed":
Snāviδka: Yt. xix, 43.

aspō-gar-, "horse-devouring":
Aži: Ys. ix, 11; xix, 40.

aša-, "righteousness":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 15 (74 names).

ašaoǰah-, "very strong":
Druǰ: Ys. ix, 8; lvii, 15.

ašaŋhāč-, "having Aša following":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. xli, 3.

ašavan-, "righteous":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12 (74 names).
(*ṛtā́van-* is used of Varuṇa in RV II, xxviii, 6; IV, i, 2; of Mitra-Varuṇa in I. cxxxvi, 4; cli, 8; V, lxv, 2; VIII, xxiii, 30; xxv, 1,

4, 7, 8; of Agni in I, lxxvii, 1; etc.; of Indra in III, liii, 8; of Tvaṣṭṛ in III, liv, 12.)

ašavastō-dā-, "giving possession of claim":
Miθra: Yt. x, 65.

ašavastəma-, "most righteous":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12 (74 names).

ašavazah-, "furthering Aša":
Haoma: Ys. viii, 9; x, 1, 14; xi, 10; Sīr. i, 30; Yt. xx, 3.

aša vahišta, "best righteousness":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 7 (74 names).

ašahunara-, "possessing great power":
Miθra: Yt. x, 25.

ašā-aoǰah-, "possessing strength through Aša":
Ātar: Ys. *xliii, 4.*

ašivant-, "possessing rewards":
Sraoša: Ys. i, 7; iii, 1, 9; iv, 12; vii, 1, 9; xxii, 9; lvi, 3, 4; lxv, 17, 18; G. v, 2, 7, 10; Yt. ii, 5; Sīr. i, 7.
Haδiš: Vsp. ix, 5.

aštraŋhāδ-, "guiding by the goad":
Miθra: Yt. x, 112.
(Cf. *áṣṭrā . . . paśusādhani* as used of Pūṣan in RV VI, liii, 9.)

aš-bərət-, "much-bringing":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 23.

ašya-, "pious":
Sraoša: Ys. i, 7; ii, 7; iii, 1, 9, 20; iv, 12, 23; vi, 6, 17; vii, 1, 9, 20; xvi, 5; xvii, 6; xxii, 9; lvi, 5; lvii, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 30, 33, 34; lx, 6; Vsp. xi, 6, 16; xii, 1; G. v, 2, 7, 10; Yt. ii, 5, 10; x, 52, 100; xi, 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23; xiii, 85, 146; xvii, 16; Sīr. i, 7, 17; ii, 7, 17; Vd. xviii, 14, 22, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 53, 54, 56, 57; xix, 15, 40; VY 14, 40; AZ 6.

aš-vandra-, "receiving much praise":
Xᵛarənah: Yt. xix, 9, 45.

ahura-, "lord":
Apąm Nahāt: Ys. i, 5; ii, 5; vi, 4; xvii, 4; lxv, 12, 13; lxx, 6; G. iii, 8; Yt. ii, 4, 9; v, 72; xix, 52; Sīr. i, 7, 30; ii, 7, 30; FW vii, 1.
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 8, 12 (74 names, twice!).
Miθra: Yt. x, 25, 69.
(*ásura-* is used of Varuṇa in RV I, xxiv, 14; II, xxvii, 10; xxviii, 7; VIII, xlii, 1 [*ásura viśvávedas*]; x, cxxxii, 4; of Mitra-Varuṇa in VII, xxxvi, 2; lxvi, 2; VIII, xxv, 4; of Agni in IV, ii, 5; V, xii, 1; xv, 1; VII, ii, 3; vi, 1; xxx, 3; of Indra in I, liv, 3; clxxiv, 1; VIII, lxxix, 6; X, xcvi, 11; xcix, 12; of Rudra in V, xlii, 11; of Soma in IX, lxxiv, 7; xcix, 1; of Savitṛ in I, xxxv, 7, 10; cx, 3; IV, liii, 1; of Pūṣan in V, li, 11; of Aryaman in V, xlii, 1; of the Ādityas in VIII, xxvii, 20.)

ahuraδāta-, "created by Ahura":
Vərəθraγna: Ys. i, 6; ii, 6; iii, 8; iv, 11; vi, 5; vii, 8; xvi, 5; xvii, 5; xxii, 8; lix, 28; lxxii, 9; Vsp. i, 6; ii, 8; G. iv, 2, 10, 13; Yt. ii, 5, 10; v, 86; x, 33, 67, 70, 80; xiii, 34, 42; xiv, 1, 2, 5, 11, 15, 17, 19, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 34, 41, 42, 47, 48, 49, 52, 54, 57, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64; Sīr. i, 7, 20; ii, 7, 20; Āfr. i, 9; Vd. xix, 37; AZ 7; FW v, 1, 2.

ahurō-ṭkaēša-, "possessing Ahura's doctrine":
"Arədvī": Ys. lxv, 1; Ny. iv, 2; Yt. v, 1.

ahūm-mərənk-, "life-destroying":
Druǰ: Ys. lvii, 15.

axᵛafna-, "sleepless":
Ahura Mazda: Vd. xix, 20.
Miθra: Ny. i, 6; Yt. x, 7.
(Cf. *áśvapnaj-* as used of the Ādityas in RV II, xxvii, 9.)

axᵛafnya-, "sleepless":
Hąm-varəti: Ys. lxii, 5; Yt. xix, 39.

axᵛarəta-, "unseized":
Xvarənah: Ys. i, 14; ii, 14; Yt. xix, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54; Sīr. i, 25, 28.

āθravatəma-, "most priestly":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12 (74 names).

āθravan-, "priest":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12 (74 names).

ādahyu-, "(dwelling) within the country":
Miθra: Ny. ii, 11; Yt. x, 144.

āδū-frāδana-, "zeal-furthering":
"Arədvī": Ys. lxv, 1; Ny. iv, 2; Yt. v, 1.

āinivan-, "?":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 46 (47 names).

āfrasāhvant-, "possessing one's wish":
Aši: Ys. lii, 1.

āyaoza-, "causing (water) to surge forward":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 47 (47 names).

āsitō-gātu-, "resting on a couch":
Hąm-varəti: Ys. lxii, 5; Yt. xix, 39.

āsu-, "swift":
Miθra: Yt. x, 65.
Sraoša: Ys. lvii, 11.
(*āśú-* is used of Indra in RV I, iv, 7; X, ciii, 1; of Soma in I, iv, 7; IX, xxxix, 1; lvi, 1; and of Vāta in IV, vii, 11.)

āsu-kairya-, "possessing swift action":
Čistā: Yt. xvi, 1.

āsu-xšvaēwa-, "swift-swinging":
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 37.

āsnō-urvan-, "possessing successful souls":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 40.

āzuiti-dā-, "giving fatness":
Miθra: Yt. x, 65.
āhuirya-, "associated with Ahura":
Amәša Spәntas: Ys. xxvi, 3; Yt. xiii, 82; xix, 15.
Daēnā: Ys. viii, 7; xi, 14; xii, 9; lii, 7; lx, 2; Yt. viii, 59, 60, Vd. ii, 2.
Sraoša: Ys. iii, 20; iv, 23; vii, 20; lvii, 1; Yt. xi, 23; xiii, 85; Sīr. i, 17; Vd. xviii, 14.
išə-xšaθra-, "kingdom-desiring":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 13 (74 names).
išə-xšaθryōtəma-, "most kingdom-desiring":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 13 (74 names).
išya-, "desirable":
Airyaman: Ys. xxvii, 5; *liv, 1;* Vsp. i, 8; ii, 10; Vd. xxii, 9, 19, 20.
īštavant-, "wealth-possessing":
Māh: Ny. iii, 7; Yt. vii, 5.
īžya-, "successful":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. xli, 3.
uxšaṭ-urvara-, "plant-increasing":
Miθra: Yt. x, 61.
Satavaēsa: Yt. xiii, 43, 44.
uγra-, "strong":
Θwāša: Yt. x, 66.
Dāmōiš Upamana: Ys. i, 15; ii, 15; iii, 17; iv, 20; vi, 14; vii, 17, 26; viii, 1; xvii, 15; xxii, 17; lxxi, 19; Vsp. i, 7; ii, 9; Yt. x, 66; xiii, 47, 48; Sīr. i, 30; ii, 30; Āfr. i, 13.
Fravašis: Ys. i, 18; ii, 11; iv, 6; vi, 10, 19; vii, 22; xvi, 5; xvii, 5; xxiii, 4; xxiv, 33; lxv, 2, 12, 13; Vsp. xi, 15; Yt. x, 66; xiii, 1, 12, 40, 47, 51, 63, 69, 70, 75, 156, 158; Sīr. i, 19, 30; Vd. xix, 37.
Miθra: Ny. ii, 14; Yt. x, 5, 78, 105, 107.
Vayu: Yt. xv, 5.
Hąm-varәti: Yt. x, 66; xix, 39.
Xvarәnah: Yt. viii, 2; x, 66, 127; xix, 9, 13, 45, 54.
(*ugrá-* is used of Indra in RV I, vii, 4; xxxiii, 5; li, 11; lv, 3; c, 12; cii, 10, cxxix, 5; cxxx, 7; etc.; of Indra-Agni in I, xxi, 4; VI, lx, 5; of Indra-Varuṇa in IV, xli, 4; of Indra-Soma in VI, lxxii, 5; of the Maruts in I, xix, 4; clxvi, 6, 8; clxxi, 5; V, lvii, 3; lx, 2; VI, lxvi, 5, 6; VII, lxxvii, 1; of Rudra in II, xxxiii, 9, 11; VIII, xxix, 5; X, cxxvi, 5; of Varuṇa in VII, xxxiv, 10; of Bhaga in VII, xli, 2; of Mitra-Varuṇa in V, lxiii, 3; of the Aśvins in I, clvii, 6; VI, lxii, 3; X, cvi, 7.)
uγra-bāzu-, "strong-armed":
Miθra: Yt. x, 75.
(*ugrábāhu-* is used of Indra in RV VIII, l, 10, and of the Maruts in VIII, xx, 12.)
uγra-zaoša-, "strong-willed":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 31.

uγrārət-, "arising strong":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 23.
upa-raoδišta-, "most restraining":
Rašnu: Yt. x, 126.
upairi-dahyu-, "(dwelling) above the country":
Miθra: Ny. ii, 11; Yt. x, 144.
uparō-kairya-, "possessing activity on high":
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 4.
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 31.
Vayu: Ys. 0, 9; xxii, 24; xxv, 5; lxxii, 10; Yt. xv, 3, 4, 5, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32, 36, 40, 57, 58; Sīr. i, 21; ii, 21; Vd. xix, 13, 16; VY 24.
Xvarənah: Yt. xix, 9, 45.
uparō-nmāna-, "possessing a house on high":
Miθra: Yt. x, 140.
upa-suxta-, "enkindled":
Ātar: Yt. x, 127.
upāpa-, "subaqueous":
Apąm Napāt: Yt. xix, 52.
Gandarəwa: Yt. xv, 28.
urvāsman-, "exhilarating":
Aša: Ys. x, 8.
urvinyant-, "crushing":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 33.
uskāṭ-yāsta-, "high-girt":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 54.
uzgərəptō-drafša-, "possessing banners lifted high":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 37.
ərəδwō-zəngа-, "possessing an uplifted ankle":
Miθra: Yt. x, 61.
Hąm-varəti: Yt. xix, 39.
ərəzatō-frašna-, "possessing a silver spear (?)":
Miθra: Yt. x, 112.
karədarəsa-, "?":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 46 (47 names).
karšō-rāzah-, "(giving) laws to the furrow":
Miθra: Yt. x, 61.
xraoždišta-, "most hard":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. i, 1 (cf. xxvi, 2).
xratu-, "wisdom":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 7 (74 names).
xratumant-, "wise":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 7 (74 names).
(*krátumant-* is used of Indra in RV I, lxii, 12; x, cxiii, 1; and of the Aśvins in I, clxxxiii, 2.)
xraθwišta-, "most wise":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. i, 1 (cf. xxvi, 2).

xrvĭ-dru-, "possessing a sanguinary mace":
Aēšma: Ys. x, 8; xxvii, 1; lvii, 32; Yt. xi, 15; xiii, 138; xvii, 5; xviii, 2; xix, 46, 95; Vd. ix, 13; x, 13, 16; xix, 43.

xrvišyant-, "terrible":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 33.

xšaēta-, "shining":
Apąm Napāt: Ys. ii, 5; vi, 4; xvii, 4; lxx, 6; G. iii, 8; Yt. ii, 9; v, 72; xix, 52; Sīr. ii, 7, 30.
Amәša Spәntas: Ys. xxvi, 3; Yt. xiii, 82; xix, 15.

xšaθrō-dā-, "kingdom-giving":
Miθra: Yt. x, 16, 65.

xšaθrō-naptar-, "grandchild of the kingdom (or, of Xšaθra?)":
Nairyo-saꞑha: Ys. xvii, 11; lix, 11; Ny. v, 6; Sīr. i, 9; ii, 9.

xšaθrya-, "royal":
Apąm Napāt: Ys. ii, 5; vi, 4; lxv, 12, 13; lxx, 6; G. iii, 8; Yt. ii, 9; v, 72; xix, 52; Sīr. ii, 7, 30.
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 15 (74 names).
Haoma: Ys. lvii, 19; Yt. ix, 17; x, 88; xvii, 37, 39.
(*kṣatríya-* is used of Varuṇa in RV IV, xlii, 1; of Mitra-Varuṇa in VII, lxiv, 2; VIII, xxv, 8; and of the Ādityas in VIII, lvi, 1.)

xšaθryōtәma-, "most royal":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 15 (74 names).

xšayant-, "ruling":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. xiii, 63, 78.
Miθra: Yt. x, 35.
(*kṣáyant-* is used of Varuṇa in RV I, xxiv, 14, and of Agni in III, xxv, 3.)

xšayamna-, "ruling":
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 49.
Miθra: Yt. x, 35.

xšōiθna-, "shining":
"Arәdvī": Yt. v, 15.
Aši: Ys. ii, 14; vi, 13; xvii, 1, 14; Yt. xiii, 107; xvii, 1; Sīr. ii, 25.
Ušah: G. v, 5.

xštāvant-, "possessing effulgence":
Māh: Ny. iii, 7; Yt. vii, 5.

xšvaš-aši-, "six-eyed":
Dahāka: Ys. ix, 8; Yt. v, 34; xv, 24.
(Cf. the *dā́sa ṣaḍakṣá triśīrṣán* of RV X, xcix, 6, identified by Sāyaṇa with Viśvarūpa, son of Tvaṣṭṛ.)

xšvivi-išu-, "possessing swift arrows":
Miθra: Yt. x, 102.

xšvivi-vāza-, "possessing swift flight":
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 37.

gaēθō-frādana-, "helping creatures":
"Arәdvī": Ys. lxv, 1; Ny. iv, 2; Yt. v, 1.

gaočiθra-, "possessing the seed of the Kine":
Māh: Ys. i, 11; iii, 13; iv, 16; vii, 13; xvi, 4; xxii, 13; Ny. iii, 1, 2, 5, 7, 8; Yt. vii, 1, 3, 5, 6, 7; xii, 33; Sīr. i, 12; ii, 12; Vd. xxi, 9.

gaoman-, "milky":
Haoma: Ys. x, 12.

gaomavant-, "milk-possessing":
Xvarənah: Yt. xviii, 1.

gayō-dā-, "life-giving":
Miθra: Yt. x, 65.

gufra-, "deep, mysterious":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 30.
Miθra: Yt. x, 25.

gərəδa-, "greedy":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 47 (47 names).

gərəδixava-, "possessing a greedy ?":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 47 (47 names).

gərəδyaoxa-, "possessing a greedy ?":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 47 (47 names).

čisti-, "insight":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 7 (74 names).

čistivant-, "possessing insight":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 7 (74 names).

ǰaγāurvah-, "alert":
Miθra: Ny. i, 6; Yt. x, 7.
Hąm-varəti: Ys. lxii, 5; Yt. xix, 39.
(Cf. *jāgṛvás-* as used of Mitra-Varuṇa in RV I, cxxxvi, 3.)

taxma-, "sturdy":
Amәša Spəntas: Ys. xxvi, 3; Yt. xiii, 82; xix, 15.
Ātar: VY 26.
Dāmōiš Upamana: Ys. i, 15; ii, 15; iii, 17; iv, 20; vi, 14; vii, 17, 26; xvii, 15; xxii, 17; lxxi, 19, 23; Vsp. i, 7; ii, 9; Yt. x, 127; Sīr. i, 30; ii, 30.
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 32, 33, 75.
Miθra: Yt. x, 61, 65, 112, 140; xi, 19.
Vayu: Yt. xv, 46 (47 names), 57.
Vāta: Yt. xv, 46; Vd. xix, 13, 16; VY 24.
Sraoša: Ys. iii, 20; iv, 23; vii, 20; lvii, 1, 11, 33; Yt. xiii, 85; Sīr. i, 17; Vd. xviii, 14.

taxmārət-, "arising sturdy":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 23.

taxmō-tąšyah-, "sturdier than sturdy":
Hąm-varəti: Vsp. vii, 3.

taxmōtəma-, "most sturdy":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 46 (47 names).

taṛ-āp-, "possessing falling water":
Miθra: Yt. x, 61.
Satavaēsa: Yt. xiii, 43, 44.

tanumąθra-, "whose body is the Spell":
Miθra: Yt. x, 25.
Sraoša: Ys. iii, 20; iv, 23; vii, 20; lvii, 1, 33; Yt. xi, 19, 23; xiii, 85; Vd. xviii, 14.
tančišta-, "most sturdy":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 75.
Haoma: Ys. xi, 7.
tafnahvant-, "possessing a glow":
Māh: Ny. iii, 7; Yt. v, 5.
(Cf. *tápasvant-* as used of Agni in RV VI, v, 4.)
tarō-ṭbaēša-, "overcoming hostility":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 47 (47 names).
(Cf. *taráddveṣas-* as used of Indra in RV I, c, 3.)
tiži-aršti-, "sharp-speared":
Miθra: Yt. x, 102.
Vayu: Yt. xv, 48 (47 names).
tižinavant-, "possessing sharpness":
Miθra: AZ 6.
tižyaršt(?)-, "sharp-spearman"(?):
Vayu: Yt. xv, 48 (47 names).
tižvant-, "possessing sharpness":
Miθra: VY 4.
tušnišad-, "sitting silently":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 29.
təmaŋhaēna-, "consisting of darkness":
Druj: Yt. xix, 95.
θamnahvant-, "careful":
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 49.
Xᵛarənah: Yt. xix, 9, 45.
θwaxša-, "active":
Haoma: Ys. xi, 10.
θrātar-, "protector":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12, 13 (74 names; twice!).
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 5, 11, 32.
(*tratár-* is used of Agni in RV I, xxxi, 12; xliv, 5; IV, iv, 10; V, xxiv, 1; VI, i, 5; xlviii, 2; VIII, xlix, 5; of Indra in I, xliv, 5; cxxix, 10, 11; clxxviii, 5; IV, xvii, 17; VI, xxv, 7; xlvii, 11; of Viṣṇu in I, clv, 4; of the Maruts in VII, lvi, 22.)
θrikamərəδa-, "three-pated":
Dahāka: Ys. ix, 8; Yt. v, 34; xv, 24.
(See under *xšvaš-aši-*.)
θrizafah-, "three-mouthed":
Dahāka: Ys. ix, 8; Yt. v, 29, 34; xv, 19, 24; xix, 47, 49, 50.
θrąfəδa-, "rich":
Saokā: Yt. xiii, 42.

daēva-, "demonic":
Druǰ: Ys. ix, 8; lvii, 15; Vd. xviii, 31.
daēvō-dāta-, "demon-created":
Āzi: Ys. xvi, 8; Vd. xviii, 19, 21, 22.
Vīδātu: Yt. x, 93.
Zyąm: Vd. i, 2, 19; ii, 22; vii, 27; xix, 43.
daiϑhu-paiti-, "lord of the land":
Miθra: Yt. x, 78, 99.
Haoma: Ys. ix, 27.
daiϑhu-frāδana-, "helping the land":
"Arədvī": Ys. lxv, 1; Ny. iv, 2; Yt. v, 1.
daδvah-, "creating, creator":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. i, 1; iv, 7, vi, 1; xxii, 1; xxiv, 12; Yt. xiii, 78; Sīr. i, 8, 15, 23; ii, 8, 15, 23; Vd. ii, 20, 21, 39, 42; iii, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16; etc.
Spənta Mainyu: Yt. x, 143.
darəγa-aršṭaya-, "possessing a long spear":
Miθra: Yt. x, 102.
darəγō-gava-, "long-handed":
Būšyąstā: Yt. x, 97, 134; Vd. xi, 9, 12; xviii, 16, 24.
darəγō-rąrōman-, "long tranquillising":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 29.
darəγō-vārəθman-, "long-protecting":
Aši: Ys. lii, 1.
darəγō-haxəδrayana-, "?":
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 1.
darəγō-xvaδāta-, "long-autonomous":
Vayah: Ny. i, 1.
Zrvan: Ys. lxii, 10; Ny. i, 8; Sīr. i, 21; ii, 21.
darši-, "hardy":
Vāta: Ys. xlii, 3; Vsp. vii, 4; Yt. viii, 33, 34; xiii, 2; xviii, 5, 7.
daršita-, "bold":
Sraoša: Ys. lvii, 11.
(*dhṛṣitá-* is used of Indra in RV VIII, xxxiii, 6; lxxxv, 17; X, cxiii, 5; cxxxviii, 4; and of the Maruts in X, lxxxiv, 1.)
darši-dru-, "possessing a bold mace":
Sraoša: Ys. iii, 20; iv, 23; vii, 20; lvii, 1; Yt. xi, 23; xiii, 85; Sīr. i, 17; Vd. xviii, 14.
darəzišta- (the reading of Ml 2), "most firm":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 46 (47 names).
dasaθavant-, "rich in possessions":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 29.
dahaka-, "?":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 45 (47 names).
dahma-, "pious":
Āfriti: Ys. ii, 15; iii, 17; iv, 20; vi, 14; vii, 17, 26; viii, 1; xvii, 15;

xxii, 17; lxx, 3; lxxi, 19; Vsp. i, 7; ii, 9; ix, 2; Sīr. i, 30; ii, 30; Āfr. i, 13; P. 32, 33.

(*dasmá-* is used of Indra in RV I, iv, 6; lxii, 5, 11, 12; cxxix, 3; etc.; of Agni in I, cxlviii, 4; II, ix, 5; IV, i, 3; etc.; of Indra-Varuṇa in IV, xli, 6; of Pūṣan in I, xlii, 10; and of the Maruts in V, xli, 13.)

dātar-, "creator":

Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 8, 12, 13 (74 names; thrice!).

dātō-saoka-, "possessing granted (or, created) advantage":

Aši: Yt. xvii, 1.

Miθra: Yt. x, 25.

dāmi-, "creative":

Ārmaiti: Ys. *xxxiv, 10;* Vsp. xix, 2.

dāmiδāta-, "created by the Creator":

Aši: Yt. xvii, 60, 61.

Gəuš Urvan: Yt. xiv, 54.

Miθra: Yt. x, 61.

Haoma: Ys. x, 10.

dušciθra-, "possessing an evil appearance (or, seed)":

Druj: Yt. xix, 94, 95.

dušxᵛarənah-, "possessing an evil glory":

Aēšma: Yt. xix, 95.

Angra Mainyu: VY 44.

dužδaēna-, "possessing an evil religion (or, ego)":

Angra Mainyu: FW iv, 2.

Dahāka: Yt. xix, 47.

dužδā-, "evil-thinking":

Aēšma: Ys. lvii, 25; Yt. x, 93, 97, 134.

Angra Mainyu: Yt. xvii, 19; Vd. vii, 27; xi, 10; xix, 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 44.

dužδāman-, "possessing an evil creation":

Angra Mainyu: Ys. lxi, 2; Vd. xix, 6.

dužδąfəδra-, "making fathers of wretched understanding" (?):

Zaurvan: Vd. xix, 43.

dužvarəštāvarez-, "working evil":

Angra Mainyu: Yt. xix, 96.

dūraēdarštar-, "far-seer":

Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12 (74 names).

dūraēdarəštəma-, "most far-seeing":

Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12 (74 names).

Rašnu: Yt. xii, 7.

dūraē-sūka-, "far-glancing":

Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 15 (74 names).

Tištrya: Yt. viii, 4.

Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 30.

dūraoša-, "holding death afar":
Haoma: Ys. xlii, 5 (cf. *xxxii, 14*); ix, 2, 4, 7, 10, 13, 19, 20, 21; x, 21; xi, 3, 10; Sīr. ii, 30.

drəγvant-, "fiendish":
Angra Mainyu: Ys. xxvii, 1; lvii, 32; lxxii, 5; Yt. i, 19; x, 118; xiii, 71, 78.

dərəzi-yaoxəδra-, "possessing sturdy attack":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 54.

dərəzra-, "sturdy":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 75.
Vayu: Yt. xv, 46 (47 names).
(Cf. *dṛḍhá-* as used of Indra in RV VIII, xxiv, 10.)

drvō-apərənāyuka-, "possessing sound children":
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 1.

drvō-urvaθa-, "possessing sound friends":
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 1.

drvō-čašman-, "possessing sound eyes":
Tištrya: Ny. i, 8; Yt. viii, 12.

drvō-pasu-, "possessing sound flocks":
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 1.

drvō-varəta-, "possessing a sound abode (?)":
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 2.
(Cf. *dhruvákṣema-* as used of Mitra-Varuṇa in RV IV, xiii, 3; V, lxxii, 2.)

drvō-staora-, "possessing sound cattle":
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 1.

drvō-stāiti-, "possessing sound standing (?)":
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 2.

ṭbaēšō-tara-, "overcoming hostility":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 47 (47 names).
(Cf. *dveṣóyut-* as used of Agni in RV IV, xi, 5.)

ṭbaēšō-taurvan-, "conquering hostility":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 14 (74 names).

nairya-, "manly, heroic":
Hąm-varəti: Vsp. vii, 3; Yt. x, 66, 71; xi, 2; xix, 38, 39; Sir. i, 22; ii, 22.
(*nárya-* is used of Indra in RV I, lxiii, 3; cxxi, 12; IV, xxix, 2; VII, xx, 1; xxv, 1; X, xxix, 7; of Viṣṇu in VII, c, 1; of Soma in IX, cvii, 1; and of the Maruts in I, clxvi, 5.)

nąmo-xšaθra-, "possessing a mild(?) kingdom":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 13 (74 names).

nąmo-xšaθryōtəma-, "possessing the mildest(?) kingdom":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 13 (74 names).

nąmyąsu-, "possessing bending twigs":
Haoma: Ys. ix, 16.

niδāsnaiθiš-, "laying weapons down":
Daēnā: Ys. xii, 9.

nimarəzišta-, " ? ":
Čistā: Yt. xvi, 1.
nispā-, " casting down ":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 45 (47 names).
nərə-gar-, " man-devouring ":
Aži: Ys. ix, 11; xix, 40.
nmānō-paiti-, " lord of the house ":
Ātar: Ys. xvii, 11.
Haoma: Ys. ix, 27.
(Cf. *dáṃpati-* as used of Agni in RV I, cxxvii, 8; V, xxii, 4; VIII, lxxiii, 7; and of Indra in VIII, lviii, 16.)
nmānyant-, " ? ":
Uṣah: G. v, 5.
paiti-pāyu-, " cautious ":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 14 (74 names).
pan̆ca-sadvara-, " possessing fifty doors(?)":
Vāsī: Ys. xlii, 4.
payah-, " milk (i. e. sap-) (giving)":
Maiδyōi-zarəmaya: Vsp. i, 2; ii, 2.
parakavistəma-, " farthest reaching ":
Rašnu: Yt. xii, 7.
pairi-dahyu-, "(dwelling) round about the country ":
Miθra: Ny. ii, 11; Yt. x, 144.
parō-kəvīd-, " far-reaching ":
Miθra: Yt. x, 102.
pātar-, " protector ":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 13 (74 names).
(Cf. *pātŕ naráām* as used of Indra in RV II, xx, 3.)
pāθmainyōtəma-, " most road(-preparing)":
Haoma: Ys. ix, 16.
pāyaoza-, " causing (water) to surge away ":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 47 (47 names).
pāyu-, " guardian ":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12 (74 names).
piθana-, " ? ":
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 1.
puθrō-dā-, " son-giving ":
Miθra: Yt. x, 65.
pərəθu-frāka-, " broadly proceeding ":
" Arədvī ": Ys. lxv, 1; Ny. iv, 2; Yt. v, 1.
Daēnā: Yt. x, 64.
pərəθu-yaona-, " possessing broad places ":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 29.
pərəθu-vaĉδayana-, " possessing a broad look-out ":
Miθra: Ny. i, 6; Yt. x, 7.
pərəθu-varah-, " broad-breasted ":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 54.

pərəθu-sraoni-, "broad-hipped":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 54.
(Cf. *pṛthujāghána-* as used of Indrāṇī in RV X, lxxxvi, 8.)
pərəθvarəšta(r?)-, "broad-spearman(?)":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 48 (47 names).
pərəθvarəšti-, "broad-speared":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 48 (47 names).
pərəθvīra-, "possessing broad vision":
Aši: Yt. xvii, 1.
pəšō-tanu-, "possessing a damned body":
Aēšma: Yt. x, 97, 137.
pouru-išta-, "desired by many":
Xᵛarənah: Yt. xviii, 1.
pouru-darštar-, "many-seeing":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12 (74 names).
pouru-darštəma-, "most many-seeing":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12 (74 names).
pouru-baēšaza-, "many-healing":
Ātar: Ny. v, 6; Sīr. i, 9; ii, 9.
Yazatas: VY 7.
pouru-mahrka-, "possessing the death of many":
Angra Mainyu: Ys. lxi, 2; Yt. iii, 13, 14; x, 97, 134; xv, 56; xvii, 19; xviii, 2; Vd. i, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19; xix, 1, 43, 44; xxii, 2, 9; VY 44; Aog. 28.
pouru-yaoxšti-, "possessing many qualities":
Miθra: Yt. x, 61.
pouru-vąθwa-, "possessing many herds":
Xᵛarənah: Yt. xviii, 1.
pouru-sarəδa-, "possessing many sorts":
Haoma: Ys. x, 12.
pouru-spaxšti-, "possessing many spies":
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 1.
pouru-spāδa-, "possessing many armies":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 37.
pouru-xᵛarənah-, "possessing much glory":
Ahura Mazda: VY 24.
Ātar: Ny. v, 6; Sīr. i, 9; ii, 9.
Yazatas: VY 7.
Xᵛarənah: Yt. xviii, 1.
pouru(š)-xᵛāθra-, "possessing much bliss (or, many blessed abodes)":
Aši: Yt. xviii, 4; xix, 54.
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 14 (74 names).
Rāman: AZ 7.
fraourvaēštrima-, "having the ingathering (of the herds)":
Ayāθrima: Ys. i, 9; ii, 9; iii, 11; iv, 14; vi, 8; vii, 11; xvii, 8; xxii, 11.

fraxšti-dā-, "giving fulness":
Miθra: Yt. x, 65.
fraxštya-, "to be questioned(?)":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 7 (74 names).
fračara-, "going before":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 45 (47 names).
fraṭ-āp-, "water-filling":
Miθra: Yt. x, 61.
framən-nar-, "man-?":
Ušah: G. v, 5.
Hąm-varəti: Vsp. vii, 3.
framən-narō-vīra-, "? man's insight":
Ušah: G. v, 5.
Hąm-varəti: Vsp. vii, 3.
frasčandayant-, "destroying":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 33.
fraspā-, "casting forth":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 45 (47 names).
fraspāyaoxəθra-, "casting forth the onslaught":
Daēnā: Ys. xii, 9.
frasrūta-, "famous":
Čistā: Yt. xvi, 1.
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 29, 30, 35.
Miθra: Yt. x, 47.
frašō-kara-, "making prepared (for the renovation of the world)"(?):
Vərəθraγna: Yt. xiv, 28.
frādaṭ-gaēθa-, "furthering creatures":
Arštāt: Ys. i, 7; ii, 7; iii, 9; iv, 12; vi, 6; vii, 9; xvii, 6; xxii, 9; Vsp. vii, 2; G. v, 2, 7, 10; Yt. ii, 5, 10; x, 139; xi, 16, 21; xiii, 18; Sīr. i, 7, 18, 26; ii, 7, 18, 26.
Aša: Ys. *xxxiii, 11* (cf. *xlvi, 12*).
Ahura Mazda: Ys. xvi, 1; lv, 3; Vsp. xi, 1.
Daēnā: VY 14.
Sraoša: Ys. i. 7; ii, 7; iii, 1, 9; iv, 12; vi, 6, 17; vii, 1, 9; xvii, 6; xxii, 9; lvi, 5; lvii, 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 19, 21, 23, 27, 30, 33; G. v, 2, 7, 10; Yt. ii, 5, 10; xi, 1; Sīr. i, 7; ii, 7, 17.
Haoma: Ys. xlii, 5; x, 21; Yt. viii, 33; Sīr. ii, 30.
frādərəsra-, "forth-shining":
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 2.
frāpa-, "having forward (flowing) water"(?):
Satavaēsa: Yt. viii, O, 62; Sīr. i, 13; ii, 13.
frāšmi-, "?":
Haoma: Ys. xlii, 5; x, 21; lvii, 19; Yt. viii, 33; ix, 17; x, 88; xvii, 37, 39; Sīr. ii, 30.
friθa-, "beloved":
Ārmaiti: Vd. ii, 10.
Sraoša: Ys. lvii, 34; Yt. xi, 20.

frya-, "dear":
Sraoša: Ys. lvii, 34; Yt. xi, 20.

fšaoni-marəza-, "touching with exuberance(?)":
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 2.

fšūmant-, "possessing cattle":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 13 (74 names).

fšūše-mąθra-, "spell of the cattle-owner" (name of Ys. lviii, 4-7):
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 13 (74 names).

baēvarə-čašman-, "possessing ten thousand eyes":
Miθra: Ys. i, 3; ii, 3; iii, 5; iv, 8; vi, 2; vii, 5; xvii, 2; xxii, 5; lix, 2; Ny. i, 6, 15; ii, 10; G. i, 2, 8, 10; Yt. vi, 5; x, 7 (cf. x, 82), 91, 141; Sīr. i, 16; ii, 16.

baēvarə-spasana-, "possessing ten thousand spies":
Miθra: Yt. x, 24, 27, 46, 60, 69, 82, 141, 143; xvii, 16.

baēšaza-, "healing":
Māh: Ny. iii, 7; Yt. vii, 5.
(Cf. *bhiṣáj-* as used of the Aśvins in RV I, cxvi, 16; clvii, 6; VIII, xviii, 8; lxxv, 1; X, xxxix, 3, 5.)

baēšazya-, "healing":
"Arədvī": Ys. lxv, 1; Ny. iv, 2; Yt. v, 1.
Aši: Yt. xvii, 1.
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 8, 12 (74 names; twice!).
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 2.
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 2.
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 30, 32.
Vanant: Yt. xxi, 1.
Haoma: Ys. ix, 16; x, 7; lvii, 19; Yt. ix, 17; x, 88; xvii, 37, 39.
Haptō-iringa: Sīr. i, 13; ii, 13.

baēšazyōtəma-, "most healing":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12 (74 names).
(Cf. *bhiṣáktama-* as used of Rudra in RV II, xxxiii, 4.)

barajāya-, "victory-bearing"(?):
Xᵛarənah: VY 40.

baraṭ-avarəta-, "bearing possessions":
Saokā: Yt. xiii, 42.

baraṭ-āyapta-, "bearing boons":
Saokā: Yt. xiii, 42.

baraṭ-zaoθra-, "bearing libations":
Čistā: Yt. x, 126; xvi, 1.

barō-xᵛarəna-, "bearing glory":
Vərəθraγna: Vd. xix, 37.

bānumant-, "shining":
Aši: Yt. xvii, 6.
(*bhānumánt-* is used of Agni in RV V, i, 11.)

bāmya-, "radiant":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 37.

bāzu-staoyah-, "stronger (i. e. deeper) than a fathom":
"Arədvī": Yt. v, 7.
bāzuš-aojah-, "possessing strength of arm":
Miθra: Yt. x, 25.
Sraoša: Ys. lvii, 33.
(*bahúojas-* is used of Indra in RV X, cxi, 6, and of the Maruts in VIII, xx, 6.)
bizəwrō-čiθra-, "possessing two-legged seed":
Druǰ: Yt. xiii, 129.
buxti-, "howling":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 47 (47 names).
bučahin-, "possessing howling":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 47 (47 names).
bərəxδa-, "welcomed":
Ārmaiti: Ys. *xxxiv, 9; xliv, 7* (cf. *xlviii, 6*).
bərəzant-, "high":
Apąm Napāt: Ys. i, 5; ii, 5; iii, 7; iv, 10; vi, 4; vii, 7; xvii, 4; xxii, 7; lxv, 12, 13; lxx, 6; G. iii, 2, 8, 11; Yt. ii, 4, 9; v, 72; xix, 52; Sīr. i, 7, 30; ii, 7, 30; FW vii, 1.
Amәša Spәntas: Ys. xxvi, 3; Yt. xiii, 82; xix, 15.
"Arədvī": Yt. v, 15.
Aši: Ys. ii, 14; vi, 13; xvii, 14; lvii, 3; Yt. viii, 38; x, 68; xi, 8; xvii, 1, 15, 17, 21, 25, 26, 31, 35, 39, 43, 47, 52, 54, 57, 58, 59; xviii, 3, 4; Sīr. ii, 25.
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 15 (74 names).
Ahura-Miθra: Ys. i, 11; ii, 11; Yt. x, 113, 145.
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 2, 4.
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 29.
Miθra: Ny. i, 6; Yt. x, 7, 25.
Rašnu: Yt. x, 100; xii, 6; xvii, 16.
Sraoša: Ys. lvii, 30.
Haoma: Ys. x, 21; Sīr. ii, 30; Vd. xix, 19.
bərəzi-δā-, "possessing lofty sight":
Sraoša: Ys. lvii, 11.
bərəzyāsta-, "high-girdled":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 29.
Miθra: Ys. lvii, 30.
mainyu spәntōtәma-, "most holy spirit":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12 (74 names).
mairya-, "deceitful":
Angra Mainyu: Vd. xxii, 2, 9.
Būšyąstā: FW x, 42.
maršō-kara-, "?":
Vərәθraγna: Yt. xiv, 28.
marždikavant-, "compassionate":
Haδiš: Vsp. ix, 5.

masita-, "great":
"Arədvī": Ys. lxv, 3.
mazišta-, "most great":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. i, 1; xvi, 1.
Daēnā: Ys. xii, 9.
Miθra: Yt. x, 142.
mazdaδāta-, "created by Mazda":
Ātar: Ys. xvii, 11; lix, 11.
Čistā: Ys. 0, 9; xxii, 24; xxv, 5; Ny. i, 8; Yt. xvi, 1, 2, 4, 7, 20; Sīr. i, 24; ii, 24.
Daēnā: Yt. ii, 12.
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 1, 5, 6, 11, 32, 33; Sīr. i, 14; ii, 14.
Rātā: Yt. ii, 3, 8; Sīr. i, 5; ii, 5; Vd. xix, 19; VY 37.
Vanant: Ny. i, 8; Yt. viii, 12; xii, 26; xxi, 1; Sīr. i, 13; ii, 13.
Vāta: Ys. **xlii, 3;** Vsp. vii, 4; Yt. viii, 33; xiv, 2; xviii, 5, 7; Vd. xix, 13, 16; VY 24.
Vərəθraγna: Vd. xix, 37.
Saokā: Yt. i, 21; ii, 2, 7; iii, 0; xii, 4, 6; xiii, 42; Sīr. i, 3; ii, 3; Vd. xxii, 3, 4.
Saokənta: Ny. i, 8.
Satavaēsa: Yt. viii. 0, 62; Sīr. i, 13; ii, 13.
Savah: Ys. i, 14; ii, 14; iii, 16; iv, 19; vi, 13; vii, 16; xvii, 14; xxii, 16; Ny. v, 5; Yt. xvii, 62; Sīr. i, 9, 25; ii, 9, 25; Vd. xix, 18.
Haoma: Ys. x, 17; xi, 8.
Xvarənah: Ys. i, 14; Ny. v, 5, 6; Yt. x, 67; xiii, 65, 134; xiv, 2; xix, 9, 13, 45, 54; Sīr. i, 9, 25, 28; ii, 9, 25, 28.
mazdayasnya-, "Mazda-honouring":
Daēnā: Ys. **xxxv, 1;** 0, 9; viii. 3; xii, 9; xiii, 1, 3, 8; xv, 1; xvi, 6; xvii, 13; xxii, 15, 22, 24, 25; xxiv, 8; xxv, 5, 6; lxx, 3; lxxi, 4; Vsp. vii, 2; ix, 2, 7; x, 2; xi, 5, 18; Ny. i, 8; G. ii, 7; v, 6; Yt. ii, 12; viii, 23, 29; ix, 26; x, 68, 117, 126; xi, 3, 16, 21; xiii, 94; xvi, 1; xvii, 16; xviii, 8; xix, 69, 82; Sīr. i, 24, 29; ii, 24, 29; Vd. ii, 42; iii, 30, 31, 40, 41, 42; v, 21; ix, 52; x, 18; xix, 6, 7, 13, 16; VY 10, 14, 34, 35, 37, 42, 52; Nīr. 41.
mazdāh-, "wise":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 8, 12 (74 names; twice!).
māyu-, "skilful":
Nairyō-saŋha: Yt. x, 52.
(Cf. *māyin-* as used of Varuṇa in RV VII, xxviii, 4; X, xcix, 10; cxlvii, 5; of Indra in VIII, lxv, 1; and of the Aśvins in VI, lxiii, 5.)
mązā-rayi-, "possessing great riches":
Aši: Ys. *xliii, 12.*
mišāk-, "?":
Aši: Ys. lii, 1.
mošu-kairya-, "possessing swift action":
Čistā: Yt. xvi, 1.

yaoxštivant-, "skilful":
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 49.
Māh: Ny. iii, 7; Yt. vii, 5.
Miθra: Yt. x, 61.
Xᵛarənah: Yt. xix, 9, 45.

yavaēǰī-, "-ever-living":
Amәša Spәntas: Ys. **xxxix, 3**; iv, 4; xxiv, 9; Vsp. ix, 4; xi, 12.

yavaēsū, "ever-advantageous":
Amәša Spәntas: Ys. **xxxix, 3**; iv, 4; xxiv, 9; Vsp. ix, 4; xi, 12.

yāirya-, "yearly":
Hušiti: Ys. i, 6; ii, 6; G. iv, 2, 10, 13; Sīr. i, 6; ii, 6; Yt. ii, 3, 5, 8, 10; iii, 11.

yāskərәt-, "making the consummation (of the world)":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 75.

yāskərәstәma-, "most making the consummation (of the world)":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 75.

yāstō-zayah-, "possessing weapons girded on":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 37.

yuxta-aspa-, "possessing yoked horses":
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 2.

raēva-, "radiant":
Hᵛarә: Ys. 0, 9; xxii, 24; Ny. i, 10, 17; Yt. vi, 7; Sīr. i, 11.

raēvant-, "radiant":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. 0, 8; i, 1; iv, 7; vi, 10; xii, 1; xvi, 3; xvii, 10; xxii, 1, 23; xxiv, 12, 28; xxv, 4; xxvii, 2; lix, 10; Vsp. xi, 16; Yt. i, 0, 22, 23; ii, 6; Sīr. i, 1, 8, 15, 23; ii, 1, 8, 15, 23; Āfr. i, 8; FW v, 1, 2.
Tištrya: Ys. i, 11; iii, 13; iv, 16; vii, 13; xvi, 4; xxii, 13; xxvii, 2; Ny. i, 8; Yt. viii, 0, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 16, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42, 55, 56, 57, 60, 62; xii, 27; xviii, 7; Sīr. i, 13; ii, 13; Vd. xix, 37.
Māh: Ny. iii, 7; Yt. vii, 5.
Miθra: Yt. x, 78.
Satavaēsa: Yt. viii, 32.
(*revánt-* is used of Indra in RV I, iv, 2; VI, xliv, 11; VIII, ii, 11, 13; of Varuṇa in X, xxxvi, 3; of Mitra in VIII, xlvii, 9; of Brahmaṇas Pati in I, xviii, 2; and of Uṣas in X, xxxv, 4.)

raoxšna-, "shining":
Ātar: VY 4.
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 2.
(Cf. *rukmá-* as used of Agni in RV I, xcvi, 5; X, xlv, 8.)

raočahvant-, "shining":
Aša: Ys. **xxxvii, 4.**

raočinavant-, "shining":
Māh: AZ 6.

raoraθa-, "possessing a swift car":
Pārəndī: Yt. viii, 38; x, 66; Sīr. i, 25; ii, 25; VY 8.
raγu-, "light, swift":
Ušah: G. v, 5.
Pārəndī: Vsp. vii, 2.
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 75.
ratuxšaθra-, "possessing lordship of the *ratu*":
Ahura Mazda: Vsp. xi, 1.
raθaēštar-, "warrior":
Ātar: Ys. lxii, 8 (gloss); Ny. v, 6; Sīr. i, 9; ii, 9; VY 26.
Miθra: Yt. v, 53; x, 25, 102, 112, 140.
Sraoša: Ys. lvii, 33.
(*ratheṣṭhá-* is used of Indra in RV I, clxxiii, 4, 5; II, xvii, 3; VI, xxi, 1; xxiii, 5; VIII, iv, 13; xxxiii, 14; IX, xcvii, 49.)
ranjaṭ-aspa-, "making horses run swiftly":
Ušah: G. v, 5.
rapant-, assisting":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. lxx, 1.
ravaṭ-aspa-, "making horses run swiftly":
Ušah: G. v, 5.
ravō-fraoθman-, "possessing swift flight":
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 2.
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 29.
razišta-, "most upright":
Čistā: Ys. 0, 9; xxii, 24; xxv, 5; Ny. i, 8; Yt. x, 126; xi, 16, 21; xvi, 1, 2, 4, 7, 20; Sīr. i, 24; ii, 24; Vd. xix, 39.
Rašnu: Ys. i, 7; ii, 7; iii, 9; vi, 6; vii, 9; xvi, 5; xvii, 6; xxii, 9; lxv, 12, 13; lxx, 3; Vsp. vii, 2; xi, 6; G. v, 2, 7, 10; Yt. ii, 5, 10; x, 126; xi, 16, 21; xii, 7, 38; xiii, 86; Sīr. i, 7, 18; ii, 7, 18; VY 52; Phl. tr. of Vd. xiii, 9.
rāmanivant-, "peaceful":
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 9.
rāma-šayana-, "possessing a peaceful abode":
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 2.
Miθra: Ny. ii, 13; Yt. x, 4.
rāsant-, "?":
Aši: Ys. lii, 1, 3.
rąrəma-, "calming":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 40.
rənjišta-, "most swift":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 75.
vaēδišta-, "most wise":
Rašnu: Yt. xii, 7.
vaēžyaršta(r?)-, "sharp-lancer(?)":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 48 (47 names).
vaēžyaršti-, "possessing a sharp lance":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 48 (47 names).

vaŋhu-dāh-, "good-giving":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. **xxxviii, 4.**
Yazatas: Ys. i, 19; xvi, 9; xxiii, 4; xxiv, 34.
(*vasudā-* is used of Indra in RV VIII, xcix, 4.)

vanaitivant-, "victorious":
Sraoša: Ys. lvii, 33.

vanaṭ-pəšana-, "winning in battle":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 30, 35, 40.

vanant-, "conquering":
Uparatāt: Ys. i, 6; ii, 6; iii, 8; iv, 11; vi, 5; vii, 8; xvii, 5; xxii, 8; lxxii, 9; Vsp. i, 6; ii, 8; G. iv, 2, 10, 13; Yt. ii, 5, 10; v, 86; x, 33; xiii, 34, 42; xiv, 64; Sīr. i, 7, 20; ii, 7, 20; Āfr. i, 9; FW v, 1, 2.

vanō-vīspa-, "all-conquering":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 44 (47 names).

varəčahvant-, "energetic":
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 49.
Māh: Ny. iii, 7; Yt. vii, 5.
Xvarənah: Yt. xix, 9, 45.

varətō-raθa-, "possessing a rolling car":
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 2.
(Cf. the *suv̥ŕd rátha* of the Aśvins in RV I, xlvii, 7; cxviii, 2, 3; clxxxiii, 2, 3; III, lviii, 3; IV, xliv, 5; X, xxxix, 1; and of Suryā in X, lxxxv, 20.)

varədaṭ-gaēθa-, "increasing creatures":
Arštāt: Ys. i, 7; ii, 7; iii, 9; iv, 12; vi, 6; vii, 9; xvii, 6; xxii, 9; Vsp. vii, 2; G. v, 2, 7, 10; Yt. ii, 5, 10; x, 139; xi, 16, 21; xiii, 18; Sīr. i, 7, 18; ii, 7, 18.

varšniharšta-, "ram-freeing":
Aγāθrima: Ys. i, 9; ii, 9; iii, 11; iv, 14; vi, 8; vii, 11; xvii, 8; xxii, 11; Vsp. i, 2.

varəzayant-, "efficacious":
Vohu Manah: Ys. *xlv, 4.*

vasō-xšaθra-, "possessing dominion at pleasure":
Haoma: Ys. ix, 25.

vasō-gaoyaoiti-, "possessing fields at pleasure":
Miθra: Yt. x, 60.

vasō-yaona-, "possessing abodes at pleasure":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 34.

vasō-yāna-, "possessing favour at pleasure":
Miθra: Yt. x, 60.

vazārət-, "arising energetic":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 23.

vahišta-, "best":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. i, 1.
(Also the conventional epithet of Aša.)

vahmō-səndah-, "prayer-fulfilling":
Miθra: Yt. x, 25.
vārəθraγna-, "victorious":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 40, 156.
vāstravant-, "possessing pastures":
Haδiš: Vsp. i, 9; ii, 11; ix, 5.
Hušiti: Ys. *xlviii, 11.*
vāstrō-dātainya-, "relating to the fodder-harvest":
Maiδyōi-šam: Vsp. i, 2; ii, 2.
vqθwō-dā-, "herd-giving":
Miθra: Yt. x, 65.
vqθwō-frāδana-, "herd-furthering":
"Arəδvī": Ys. lxv, 1; Ny. iv, 2; Yt. v, 1.
vqθwya-, "relating to herds":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 7 (74 names).
viδaēvō-kara-, "making demon-foes":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 46 (47 names).
viδčōišta-, "best-deciding":
Rašnu: Yt. xii, 7.
vindaṭ-spāδa-, "army-finding":
Miθra: Yt. x, 35.
vindixᵛarənah-, "glory-finding":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 45 (47 names).
vivaoza-, "causing (water) to surge apart":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 47 (47 names).
vīčira-, "deciding":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 40.
vītar-, "pursuer":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 13 (74 names).
vīdaēva-, "antidemonic":
"Arəδvī": Ys. lxv, 1; Ny. iv, 2; Yt. v, 1.
Ahura Mazda: Yt. xiii, 146.
vīdaka-, "finding(?)":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 45 (47 names).
vīdvaēštva-, "unantagonisable":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 8 (74 names).
vīdvant-, "knowing":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. *xlv, 3; xlviii, 2.*
vīδavi-, "free from deceit":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 14 (74 names).
vīvāyant-, "driving hence":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 40.
vispataš-, "all-shaping":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 14 (74 names).
vīspaiti-, "lord of the village":
Miθra: Yt. x, 112.

Haoma: Ys. ix, 27.

(*viśpáti-* is used of Agni in RV I, xii, 2; xxvi, 7; lx, 2; clxiv, 1; III, ii, 10; xiii, 5; V, iv, 3; vi, 5; VII, vii, 4; xv, 7; VIII, xxiii, 13, 14; xliv, 26; xlix, 19; X, iv, 4; of Indra in III, xl, 3; and of Varuṇa in VIII, xxv, 16.)

vīspavanya-, "all-conquering":

Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 14 (74 names).

vīspa vohu mazdaδāta ašačiθra, "all good things Mazda-given, with seed from Aša":

Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 7 (74 names).

vīspa-xvāθra-, "(giving) all comfort":

Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 14 (74 names).

vīspā-hišat-, "all-perceiving":

Ahura Mazda: Ys. xlv, 4; Yt. i, 8 (74 names).

vīspō-afsman-, "containing all verses":

Daēnā: VY 14.

vīspō-mahrka-, "possessing the death of all":

Angra Mainyu: Yt. i, 19; xiii, 71.

vīspō-vīδvant-, "all-knowing":

Ahura Mazda: Yt. xii, 1; Vd. xix, 20, 26.

Miθra: Yt. x, 24, 27, 35, 46, 60, 69, 82, 141, 143.

(Cf. *viśvávedas-* as used of Mitra-Varuṇa in RV VIII, xxv, 3; of Agni in I, xii, 1; xxxiii, 6; xliv, 7; cxxviii, 8; cxliii, 4; cxlvii, 3; III, xxv, 1; IV, iv, 13; viii, 1; X, iv, 4; of Varuṇa in VIII, xlii, 1; of the Maruts in I, lxiv, 8; V, lx, 7; of the Ādityas in V, lxvii, 3; VIII, xviii, 11; xlvii, 3; of the All-Gods in VIII, xxvii, 2, 4, 11, 19-21; *viśvavíd-* is used of Agni in III, xix, 1; xxix, 7; V, iv, 3; X, xci, 3; and of Soma in IX, xxviii, 1; xcvii, 56.)

vīspō-vərəzya-, "all-working":

Daēnā: VY 14.

vīspō-hankərəθya-, "?":

Daēnā: VY 14.

vīspē-mazišta-, "all-greatest":

Sraoša: Ys. *xxxiii, 5.*

vīšavant-, "venomous":

Aži: Ys. ix, 11; xix, 40.

vīšō-vačpa-, "poison-spitting":

Aži: Ys. ix, 30.

vouru-gaoyaoiti-, "possessing wide pastures":

Miθra: Ys. 0, 8; i, 3; ii, 3; iii, 5; iv, 8; vi, 2; vii, 5; xvi, 5; xvii, 2; xxii, 4, 23; xxv, 4; lix, 2; lxv, 12, 13; lxviii, 22; lxx, 3; lxxii, 6; Vsp. i, 6; ii, 9; vii, 2; xi, 6; Ny. i, 6, 15; ii, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17; G. i. 2, 7, 8, 10; Yt. ii, 4, 9; vi, 5; viii, 7, 38; x, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 48, 52, 60, 78, 86, 87, 91, 94, 95, 98, 99, 114, 115. 120, 121, 122, 124, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 139,

146; xi, 16, 21; xiii, 18, 86, 95; xvii, 16; xix, 35; Sīr. i, 7, 16; ii, 7, 16; Vd. iii, 1; xix, 15.

(Cf. *urúgavyuti-* as used of Soma in RV IX, xc, 4; the *urví gávyūti* of Aditi in IX, lxxiv, 3; and the *urví gávyūti* to which Mitra-Varuṇa hasten in V, lxvi, 3.)

vouru-dōiθra-, "wide-seeing":

Rātā: Yt. ii, 3, 8; Sīr. i, 5; ii, 5; VY 8.

Saokā: Yt. ii, 2, 7; iii, 0; Sīr. i, 3; ii, 4; Vd. xix, 37.

(Cf. *urucákṣas-* as used of Suryā in RV VII, xxxv, 8; lxiii, 4; and of Varuṇa in I, xxv, 5, 16.)

vouru-rafnah-, "wide-reaching":

Ahura Mazda: Ys. i, 1.

Daēnā: VY 14.

vohumant-, "possessing goods":

Ahura Mazda: Ys. xii, 1; Vd. xix, 11.

vohvaršta(rī)-, "weal-worker":

Vayu: Yt. xv, 44 (47 names).

vohvāvant-, "possessing good light":

Māh: Ny. iii, 7; Yt. vii, 5.

vərəθrajan-, "victorious":

Ahura Mazda: Ys. lv, 4; Vsp. xi, 1.

Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 47, 156.

Vāta: Yt. x, 9; xii, 4, 6; xiii, 47, 48.

Sraoša: Ys. i, 7; ii, 7; iii, 1, 9; iv, 12; vi, 6, 17; vii, 1, 9; xvii, 6; xxii, 9; lvi, 5; lvii, 1, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 22, 27, 30, 33; Vsp. xvi, 1; G. v, 2, 7, 10; Yt. ii, 10; xi, 1, 3, 7, 8; Sīr. ii, 7, 17; Vd. xix, 40; AZ 6.

Haoma: Ys. ix, 16 (cf. x, 9).

(Cf. *vṛtrahán-* as a standing epithet of Indra in RV; also of Agni in I, lix, 6; lxxiv, 3; lxxviii, 4; III, xx, 4; VI, xvi, 14, 19, 48; VIII, lxiii, 4; X, lxix, 12; of Indra-Agni in I, cviii, 3; III, xii, 4; VI, lx, 3; VII, xciii, 1, 4; xciv, 11; VIII, xxxviii, 2; of Soma in I, xci, 5; IX, i, 3; xxiv, 6; lxxxix, 7; X, xxv, 9; of Manyu in X, lxxxiii, 3; and of the Aśvins in VIII, viii, 9, 22.)

vərəθravan-, "victorious":

Vərəθraγna: Yt. x, 59.

vərəθravant-, "victorious":

Miθra: Yt. x, 141.

vərəzi-čašman-, "possessing energetic eyes":

Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 29.

vərəzi-dōiθra-, "possessing energetic eyes":

Amәša Spәntas: Ys. xxvi, 3; Yt. xiii, 82; xix, 15.

vərəzi-saoka-, "possessing energetic advantage":

Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 15 (74 names).

vərəzi-savah-, "possessing energetic profit":

Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 15 (74 names).

vərəzyaŋhva-, "possessing energetic onset":
Mąθra: Ys. i, 18; iii, 15; iv, 18; vii, 15; xxii, 25; Vsp. xxi, 2; Sīr. i, 29.
Ząm: Ys. x, 4.
vyāxana-, "eloquent (or, relating to assemblies?)":
Ātar: Yt. xiii, 85.
Nairyō-saŋha: Vd. xxii, 7, 13.
Miθra: Ny. i, 6; Yt. x, 7, 25, 61, 65.
vyāvant-, "beaming":
Aši: Yt. xvii, 6.
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 2.
(Cf. *vibhāvan* as used of Agni in RV I, lix, 7; lxvi, 2; III, iii, 9; IV, i, 8, 12; V, i, 9; iv, 2; VI, iv, 2; xi, 4; X, vi, 2; lxi, 20; xci, 1; and of Uṣas in I, xxx, 20; xlviii, 1; xcii, 14; IV, lii, 6; V, lxxix, 4, 10; VIII, xlvii, 10.)
saokavant-, "advantageous":
Māh: Ny. iii, 7; Yt. vii, 5; VY 4.
saočahiṁ-, "flaming":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 47 (47 names).
saočinavant-, "flaming":
Ātar: AZ 6.
saiδi-, "?":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 47 (47 names).
sarəδā-, "cold-giving":
Maiδyāirya: Vsp. i, 2; ii, 2.
savō-gaēθa-, "possessing advantage for creatures":
Arštāt: Vsp. vii, 2; Yt. xi, 16.
sima-, "horrible":
Aži: Ys. ix, 30.
suxra-, "red":
Ātar: Ys. *xxxi, 19; li, 9.*
(*śukrá-* is used of Agni in RV I, lxix, 1; IV, i, 7; xi, 2; V, xxi, 4; xxiii, 4; VI, xvi, 34; xlviii, 7; VII, i, 8; VIII, xlix, 3; X, xxi, 7; and of Soma in III, xxxii, 2; IX, xcvii, 32; cix, 3, 5, 6.)
sūra-, "mighty":
Apąm Napāt: Yt. xiii, 95.
Aši: Yt. xvii, 1, 7, 14.
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 15 (74 names); xiii, 78.
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 4.
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 1, 5, 6, 11, 32, 33; Sīr. i, 14; ii, 14.
Fravašis: Ys. ii, 6; vi, 5; xvi, 5; xvii, 18; xxvi, 1, 3; lix, 10, 27; lx, 4; lxxi, 5; Vsp. xiii, 0; Ny. i, 9; G. i, 4; ii, 7; Yt. ii, 10; x, 3; xiii, 21, 26, 27, 46, 73, 75, 76, 79, 147; Sīr. ii, 19.
Miθra: Ny. i, 6; ii, 15; Yt. x, 6, 7, 15, 24, 27, 31, 33, 46, 56, 60, 69, 76, 82, 141, 143.
Satavaēsa: Yt. viii, 0, 62; Sīr. i, 13; ii, 13.

Sraoša: Ys. lvii, 11; Yt. x, 52; xiii, 146.

(The term is one of the standing epithets of the amnestonymous goddess known as Arədvī Sūrā Anāhitā.)

səvin-, "advantageous":

Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 15 (74 names).

səvišta-, "most mighty":

"Arədvī": Ny. i, 19; Yt. v, 18, 22, 26, 30, 34, 38, 42, 46, 50, 54, 58, 69, 73, 82, 105, 109, 113, 117, 130.

Ahura Mazda: Ys. *xxviii, 5; xxxiii, 11;* xvi, 1; lv, 3; lvi, 1; Vsp. xi, 1; xv, 2; Yt. i, 8, 15 (74 names; twice!); AZ 2.

Tištrya: Yt. viii, 43, 47.

Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 4, 9, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30.

Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 31, 34, 75, 147.

Miθra: Yt. x, 6, 13, 31.

(*śáviṣṭha-* is used of Indra in RV I, lxxx, 1; lxxxiv, 1, 19; clxv, 7; V, xxix, 13, 15; xxxv, 8; xxxviii, 2; VI, xxii, 2, 7; xxvi, 7; xxxv, 3; VII, xxi, 5; VIII, vi, 31; xiii, 12; xlvi, 9; l, 1; li, 4; lv, 12; lix, 6; lxxix, 4; lxxxvi, 14; X, cxvi, 1; and of Agni in I, cxxvii, 11.)

skutara-, "?":

Angra Mainyu: Vd. xix, 3.

spaēta-, "white":

Čistā: Yt. x, 126.

(*śvetá-* is used of Agni in RV III, i, 4; and of Indra-Agni in VIII, xl, 8.)

spənahvant-, "holy":

Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 8 (74 names).

spas-, "watcher":

Miθra: Yt. x, 61.

(*spaś-* is used of Mitra-Varuṇa in RV VI, lxvii, 5 [their spies are mentioned in VII, lxi, 3]; of Indra in VIII, l, 15 [cf. I, xxxiii, 8]; of Surya in IV, xiii, 3; of the Ādityas in VIII, xlvii, 11; spies of Varuṇa in I, xxv, 13; VII, lxxxvii, 3; of Agni in IV, iv, 3; and of the gods in X, x, 8.)

spaštar-, "observer":

Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 13 (74 names).

spānah-, "sanctity":

Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 8 (74 names).

spārō-dāšta-, "?":

Aši: Yt. xix, 54.

Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 35.

spəništa-, "most holy":

Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 75.

Rašnu: Yt. x, 126; xii, 7.

spənta-, "holy":

Ātar: Ys. lxii, 8 (gloss); Ny. v, 6; Yt. xiii, 85.

Fravašis: Ys. ii, 11; vi, 5, 10, 19; xvi, 5; xvii, 5; Vsp. xiii, 0; xix, 1; Ny. i, 9; G. i, 4; ii, 7; Yt. xiii, 46, 73, 75.
Vāta: Ys. xvi, 5; Ny. i, 8.

sraēšta-, "most beautiful":
Aša: Ys. xxxvii, 4; lx, 12; lxxi, 30; Yt. iii, 0, 18; Sīr. i, 3.
Ahura Mazda: Ys. i, 1.

sraota-gaoša-, "possessing an ear for hearing(?)":
Daēnā: VY 14.

sraotanu-, "sturdy-bodied":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 40.

sraoθra-, "hearing"
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 29.

sravašəmna-, "possessing sturdy ?":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 40.

srīra-, "beautiful":
Aša: Ys. xxxv, 3.
Aši: Yt. xiii, 107; xvii, 6, 60, 61.
Ārmaiti: Vd. xix, 13, 16.
Ušah: G. v, 5.
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 9.
Daēnā: Yt. x, 64.
Vāta: Yt. xiv, 2.
Vohu Manah: Vd. xix, 19.
Haoma: Ys. lvii, 19; Yt. ix, 17; x, 88; xvii, 37, 39.

sruṭ-gaoša-, "possessing a hearing ear":
Miθra: Yt. x, 107; xix, 35.
(Cf. *śrútkarṇa-*, as used of Agni in RV I, xliv, 13; xlv, 7; X, cxl, 6; and of Indra in VII, xxxii, 5; VIII, xlv, 17.)

sruṭ-gaošōtəma-, "possessing a most hearing ear":
Apąm Napāt: Yt. xix, 52.

srvara-, "horned":
Aži: Ys. ix, 11; xix, 40.

srvō-zana-, "belonging to a horned race":
Snāviδka: Yt. xix, 43.

šaētō-frāδana-, "wealth-furthering":
"Arədvī": Ys. lxv, 1; Ny. iv, 2; Yt. v, 1.

zaēnahvant-, "watchful":
Miθra: Yt. x, 61.

zaoyārət-, "summons-answering":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 23.

zantu-paiti-, "lord of the district":
Haoma: Ys. ix, 27.

zaraθustri-, "Zarathushtrian":
Daēnā: Ys. viii, 7; xi, 14; xii, 9; lii, 7; lx, 2; Yt. viii, 59, 60; Vd. ii, 2.

zaranyō-aoθra-, "possessing golden shoes":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 57.

zaranyō-aiwyđwhana-, "possessing a golden girdle":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 57.
zaranyō-xaoδa-, "possessing a golden helmet":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 57.
zaranyō-čaxra-, "possessing golden wheels":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 57.
(*hiraṇyacakra-*, is used of the Maruts in RV I, lxxxviii, 5.)
zaranyō-pusa-, "possessing a golden diadem":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 57.
zaranyō-mina-, "possessing a golden necklace":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 57.
zaranyō-vastra-, "possessing golden clothing":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 57.
zaranyō-vārəθman-, "possessing a golden breastplate":
Miθra: Yt. x, 112.
zaranyō-vāša-, "possessing a golden car":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 57.
(Cf. *hiraṇyaratha-*, as used of Agni in RV IV, i, 8; and of the Maruts in V, lvii, 1.)
zaranyō-zaya-, "possessing golden weapons":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 57.
zairi-gaona-, "gold-coloured":
Haoma: Ys. ix, 16; x, 12.
(Cf. *hiraṇyavarṇa-* as used of Indra in RV V, xxxviii, 2; of Apām Napāt in II, xxxv, 10; of the Maruts in II, xxxiv, 11; of Uṣas in III, lxi, 2; VII, lxxvii, 2; and *hiraṇyarūpa-*, of Apām Napāt in II, xxxv, 10; and of Agni in IV, iii, 1; X, xx, 9.)
zairita-, "yellow":
Aži: Ys. ix, 11, 30; xix, 40.
(Cf. *hárita-* as used in Indra in RV III, xliv, 4.)
zairi-dōiθra-, "golden-eyed":
Haoma: Ys. lvii, 19; Yt. ix, 17; x, 88; xvii, 37, 39.
(Cf. *hiraṇyakṣá-* as used of Savitṛ in RV I, xxxv, 8.)
zairina-, "putting to sleep":
Būšyąstā: Yt. xviii, 2; Vd. xi, 9, 12.
zairi-pāšna-, "golden-heeled":
Gandarəwa: Yt. v, 38; xix, 41.
zairimyāvant-, "possessing a (fixed) abode":
Māh: Ny. iii, 7; Yt. vii, 5.
zavanō-sū-, "helping at summons":
Apąm Napāt: Yt. xix, 52.
zavanō-srūt-, "summons-hearing":
Miθra: Yt. x, 61.
Satavaēsa: Yt. xiii, 44.
(*havanaśrút-* is used of Rudra in RV II, xxxiii, 15; of Indra in I, x, 10; VIII, xii, 23; of Indra-Agni in VI, lix, 10; of Indra-

Varuṇa in VII, lxxxiii, 3; of the Aśvins in V, lxxv, 5; VIII, viii, 7; of the Ādityas in VIII, lvi, 5; and of the All-Gods in VI, lii, 10.)

zavanō-svan-, "helping at summons":
Miθra: Yt. x, 76.

zāiri-, "golden":
Haoma: Ys. **xlii, 5;** ix, 17, 30, 31, 32; x, 13, 21; Vsp. xi, 2; Sīr. ii, 30; Vd. xix, 19.
(Cf. *hári-* as used of Soma in RV Iü, iii, 9; v, 4; lvii, 2; lxx, 8; xcvii, 6, 9; ci, 15; ciii, 2, 4; cvii, 10; X, ci, 10.)

zinaka-, "?":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 45 (47 names).

zɪrɪjāh-, "?":
Astō-vīδōtu: Aog. 57.

žnātar-, "knower":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12, 13 (74 names; twice!).

žnōišta-, "best-knowing":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 13 (74 names).

haomačana-, "promising Haoma":
Mąθra: Yt. xviii, 8.

hačaṭ-aša-, (ed. *-aēša-*), "having Aša following":
Daēnā: VY 14.

haθravana-, "conquering at once":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 46 (47 names).
(Cf. *satrājít-* as used of Indra in RV II, xxi, 1; VIII, lxxxvii, 4.)

haθravanya-, "conquering at once":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 14 (74 names).

havaŋhō-dā-, "giving beatitude":
Miθra: Yt. x, 65.

hazaŋra-gaoša-, "possessing a thousand ears":
Miθra: Ys. i, 3; ii, 3; iii, 5; iv, 8; vi, 2; vii, 5; xvii, 2; **xxii, 5;** lix, 2; Ny. i, 6, 15; ii, 10; G. i, 2, 8, 10; Yt. **vi, 5; x, 7,** 91, I41; xvii, 16; Sīr. i, 16; ii, 16.

hazaŋra-yaoxšti-, "possessing a thousand faculties":
Dahāka: Ys. ix, 8; AZ 3.
Miθra: Yt. x, 35 (cf. x, 82), 107; xix, 35.

hāta-marəni-, "mindful of what is merited":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 8 (74 names).

hąm-vainti-, "conquering":
Āxšti: Yt. ii, 1, 6; xv, 1; Vsp. vii, 1; Sīr. i, 2; ii, 2.

hąm-varəitivant-, "capable of defending":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 33.
Sraoša: Ys. lvii, 33.

huaŋvitačina-, "possessing a good onset":
Čistā: Yt. xvi, 1.

hukərəp-, "well-bodied":
Haoma: Ys. ix, 16.

hukərəptəma-, "best-bodied":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. i, 1.

huxratu-, "possessing good wisdom":
Haoma: Ys. ix, 23; x, 2.
(***sukrátu-*** is used of Soma in RV I, xci, 2; IX, ii, 3; xii, 4; xlviii, 3; lxiii, 28; lxv, 30; lxx, 6; lxxii, 8; lxxiii, 8; cii, 3; of Agni in I, cxxviii, 4; cxli, 11; cxliv, 7; III, i, 22; V, xi, 2; xxv, 9; VI, xvi, 3; VIII, xix, 17; lxiii, 7; lxxiii, 8; X, cxxii, 2, 6; of Indra in I, v, 6; li, 13; lv, 6; II, xxxi, 3; III, xlix, 1; VI, xxx, 3; VIII, i, 18; xxxiii, 5; X, cxliv, 6; of Varuṇa in I, xxv, 10, 12; V, lxv, 1; VIII, xxv, 2; of Mitra-Varuṇa in III, lxii, 16; VII, lxi, 2; VIII, xxv, 5, 8; of Bṛhaspati in I, cxxxix, 10; of Savitṛ in VI, lxxi, 1; and of Surya in VI, xxx, 2.)

huxšaθra-, "possessing good dominion":
Amәša Spәntas: Ys. **xxxv, 1**; ii, 2; iv, 4, 25; vi, 1; xiii, 4; xiv, 2; xxiv, 9; xxv, 1; lvi, 3, 4; lviii, 5; lix, 1; lxiii, 3; lxv, 12, 13, 17; lxx, 1; Vsp. v, 2; viii, 1; ix, 4; xi, 12; Yt. ii, 6; Sīr. ii, 1, 8, 15, 23; Āfr. ii, 3; Vd. xix, 9; FW v, 2.
Ahura Mazda: Vsp. xi, 1.
(***sukṣatrá-*** is used of Indra in RV V, xxxii, 5; xxxviii, 1; of Varuṇa in VII, lxiv, 1; lxxxix, 1; of Mitra in III, lix, 4; and of Varuṇa, Mitra, and Agni in VI, xlix, 1; li, 10.)

huxšaθrōtəma-, "possessing best dominion":
Ahura Mazda: Āfr. iii, 6.

hučiθra-, "possessing a good appearance":
Aši: Yt. xvii, 15.

hutāšta-, "well-shaped":
Ama: Ys. i, 6; ii, 6; iii, 8; iv, 11; vi, 5; vii, 8; xvii, 5; xxii, 8; lxxii, 9; G. iv, 2, 10, 13; Yt. ii, 5, 10; xiii, 42; xiv, 7, 9, 44; Sīr. i, 7, 20; ii, 7, 20; Āfr. i, 9; FW v, 1, 2.
Miθra: Ny. i, 6; Yt. x, 7.

hudānu-, "possessing good insight":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 15 (74 names).

hudānuštəma-, "possessing best insight":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 15 (74 names).

hudōiδra-, "possessing good eyes":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 29.

huδā-, "possessing good insight":
Amәša Spәntas: Ys. **xxxv, 1**; ii, 2, 12; iv, 4, 25; vi, 1; xiii, 4; xiv, 2; xxiv, 9; xxv, 1; lvi, 3, 4; lviii, 5; lix, 1; lxiii, 3; lxv, 12, 13, 17; lxx, 1; Vsp. v, 2; viii, 1; ix, 4; xi, 12; Yt. ii, 6; Sīr. ii, 1, 8, 15, 23; Āfr. ii, 3; Vd. xix, 9; FW v, 2.
Ahura Mazda: Ys. *xlviii, 3;* xvi, 1.
Ātar: Ny. v, 4.
Vāta: Ys. xvi, 5; Ny. i, 8; Sīr. i, 22; ii, 22.

huδāta-, "well-created":
Aši: Yt xvii, 5.

Miθra: Yt. x, 142.
Haoma: Ys. ix, 16.

huδāman-, "well-intentioned":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. i, 1.

hunaravant-, "skilful":
Čistā: Yt. xvi, 1.
(Cf. *sūnára-* as used of Uṣas in RV I, xlviii, 5, 8, 10; IV, lii, 1; VII, lxxxi, 1.)

hunairyånk-, "skilful":
Miθra: Yt. x, 102.

hupaθmainya-, "possessing good paths":
Čistā: Yt. xvi, 1.

hupairitan-, "well-extending round about (?)":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 46 (47 names).

hupairispā-, "well-flourishing round about (?)":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 46 (47 names).

humāya-, "possessing good blessings":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. **xli, 3.**

huyaona-, "possessing good places":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 29.

huyazata-, "well-honoured":
Aši: Yt. xvii, 1.

huraoδa-, "well-formed":
Ama: Ys. i, 6; ii, 6; iii, 8: iv, 11; vi, 5; vii, 8; xvii, 5; xxii, 8; lxxii, 9; G. iv, 2, 10, 13: Yt. ii, 5, 10; xiv, 7, 9, 44; Sīr. i, 7, 20; ii, 7, 20; Āfr. i, 9.
"Arədvī": Yt. v, 15.
Aši: Ys. ii, 14; vi, 13; xvii, 14; Sīr. ii, 25; Yt. xvii, 1.
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 2.
Nairyo-saṿha: Ys. lvii, 3; Yt. xi, 8; VY 40.
Sraoša: Ys. ii, 7; vi, 6, 17: xvii, 6; lvi, 5; lvii. 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 30, 33; lxv, 12, 13; Yt. xi, 1; Sīr. ii, 7, 17; Vd. xviii, 22, 31, 34, 37, 40, 43, 46, 49, 54, 57; xix, 15, 40; AZ 6; FW v, 1, 2.

hurāθya-, "possessing a good chariot":
Miθra: Yt. x, 76.
(Cf. *surátha-* as used of the Aśvins in RV I, xxii, 2; of the Maruts in V, lvii, 2; and of Agni in IV, ii, 4 [in these two instances also with *svášva-*].)

hušayana-, "possessing a good abode":
Tištrya: Yt. viii, 2.
Miθra: Ny. ii, 13; Yt. x, 4.
(Cf. *sukṣití-* as used of Soma in RV I. xci, 21.)

hušyaoθana-, "beneficent":
Ārmaiti: Ys. *xlv, 4.*

huzaēna-, "possessing good weapons":
Miθra: Vd. xix, 15, 28.
(Cf. ***svāyudhá-*** as used of Soma in RV IX, iv, 7; xv, 8; xxxi, 6; lxv, 5; lxxxvi, 12; lxxxvii, 2; xcvi, 16; cviii, 15; cx, 12; of Indra in VI, xvii, 13: X, xlvii, 2; and of the Maruts in V, lvii, 2; lxxxvii, 5; VII, lvi, 11.)

hvarəz-, "beneficent":
Haoma: Ys. ix, 16.

hvarə-hazaoša-, "possessing like will with the Sun":
Amәša Spәntas: Ny. i, 1; Yt. x, 51; xiii, 92.

hvaspa-, "possessing good horses":
Miθra: Yt. x, 76.
(***svášva-*** is used of Indra in RV IV, xxix, 2; V, xxxiii, 3; of the Aśvins in VII, lxviii, 1; lxix, 3; of Agni in IV, ii, 4; and of the Maruts in V, lvii, 2 [in these two instances also with ***surátha-***].)

hvāxšta-, "possessing good pacification":
Vərәθraγna: Yt. xiv, 28.

hvāpah- (***baγa***), "possessing good works":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. x, 10; lxxi, 10; Yt. x, 92.

hvāmarždika-, "very merciful":
Miθra: Yt. x, 140.

hvāyaona-, "possessing a good place":
Čistā: Yt. xvi, 1.
Vərәθraγna: Yt. xiv, 28.

hvāyaozda-, "possessing good battle":
Čistā: Yt. xvi, 1.

hvārәt-, "arising well":
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 23.

hvō-aiwišak-, "well-attending":
Aši: Ys. lii, 1.

xvaētvadaθa-, "having performed next-of-kin marriage":
Daēnā: Ys. xii, 9.

xvaδāta-, "autonomous":
Θwāša: Ys. lxxii, 10; Ny. i, 8; Yt. x, 66; Sīr. i, 21; ii, 21; Vd. xix, 13, 16; VY 24.
Raočā: Ys. i, 16; iii, 18; iv, 21; vii, 18; xvi, 6; xxii, 18; Yt. xii, 35; Sīr. i, 30; ii, 30; Vd. xix, 35.
(Cf. ***svadhāvant-*** as used of Agni in RV I, xxxvi, 12; cxliv, 7; cxlvii, 2; III, xx, 3; IV, v, 2; x, 6; xii, 3; V, iii, 5; VIII, xliv, 20; X, xi, 8; cxlii, 3; of Indra in I, lxiii, 6; clxxiii, 6; II, xx, 6; III, xli, 8; IV, xx, 4; VI, xvii, 4; xxi, 3; VII, xx, 1; X, xlii, 9; of Varuṇa in VII, lxxxvi, 4, 8; lxxxviii, 5; of Pūṣan in VI, lviii, 1; and of Viśvakarman in X, lxxxi, 5; cf. also ***svadhávan-*** as used of Agni in V, iii, 2; of Indra in V, xxxii, 10; of Rudra in VII, xlvi, 1; and of the dual world [***ródasī***] in VII, xxxi, 7.)

xᵛanaṭ-čaxra-, "possessing resounding wheels":
Aši: Yt. xvii, 1.
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 2.
xᵛarənaŋuhastəma-, "most glorious":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12 (74 names).
xᵛarənaŋhan-, "glorious":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 12 (74 names).
xᵛarənah-, "glory":
Vayu: Yt. xv, 48 (47 names).
xᵛarənahvant-, "possessing glory":
Ahura Mazda: Ys. 0, 8; i, 1; ii, 11; iv, 7; vi, 10; xii, 1; xvi, 3; xvii, 10; xxii, 1, 23; xxiv, 12, 28; xxv, 4; xxvii, 2; lix, 10; Vsp. xi, 16; Yt. i, 0, 22, 23; ii, 6; Sīr. i, 1, 8, 15, 23; ii, 1, 8, 15, 23; Āfr. i, 8; ii, 1, 3, 5; iv, 2; FW v, 1, 2.
Tištrya: Ys. i, 11; iii, 13; iv, 16; vii, 13; xvi, 4; xxii, 13; xxvii, 2; Ny. i, 8; Yt. viii, 0, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 16, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42, 55, 56, 57, 60, 62; xii, 27; xviii, 7; Sīr. i, 13; ii, 13; Vd. xix, 37.
Māh: Ny. iii, 7; Yt. vii, 5.
Satavaēsa: Yt. viii, 32.
xᵛarənō-dā-, "glory-giving":
Miθra: Yt. x, 16.
xᵛāθravana-, "possessing well-being":
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 1.
xᵛāθravant-, "possessing well-being":
Ahura Mazda: Yt. i, 14 (74 names).
Ušah: G. v, 5.
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 32.
Haδiš: Vsp. ix, 5.
xᵛāpara-, "bringing welfare":
Aši: Ys. ii, 14; vi, 13; xvii, 14; Sīr. ii, 25; Yt. xiii, 157.
Fravašis: Yt. xiii, 32.
(Cf. *supārá-* as used of Indra in RV III, 1, 3; VI, xlvii, 7; VIII, xiii, 2?)
xᵛāsaoka-, "possessing good advantage":
Drvāspā: Yt. ix, 2.
xᵛāstra-, "possessing good pastures":
Rāman: Ys. 0, 8; i, 3; ii, 3; iii, 5; iv, 8; vi, 2; vii, 5; xvi, 5; xvii, 2; xxii, 5, 23; xxv, 4; lix, 2; lxxii, 6, 10; Vsp. i, 6; ii, 9; Ny. ii, 10; G. i, 2. 7, 8, 10; Yt. ii, 4, 9; x, 146; Sīr. i, 7, 16, 21; ii, 7, 16, 21; Vd. iii, 1; AZ 7.
xᵛəŋg-darəsa-, "possessing the appearance of the sun":
Xšaθra: Ys. *xliii, 16.*
xᵛəŋvant-, "sunny":
Aša: Ys. *xxxii, 2.*
(Cf. *svárvant-* as used of Indra in RV VIII, lxxxvi, 1; of Agni in I, lix, 4; of Aditi in I, cxxxvi, 3; of Uṣas in X, xi, 3; and of the gods in VI, 1, 2.)

NAMES OF DIVINE OR DEMONIC BEINGS.

[Epithets in italics are peculiar to the divine being under whose name they are recorded; epithets marked with an asterisk (*) under Ahura Mazda and Vayu are found in the lists of seventy-four and forty-seven names respectively.]

Aēšma: (4)
ərvī̆-dru-, dušxᵛarənah-, duždā-, *pəšō-tanu-*.

Aēšma and Angra Mainyu:
dušxᵛarənah-, duždā.

Angra Mainyu: (10)
dušxᵛarənah-, duždaēna-, duždā-, *duždāman-*, *dužvarəštāvarəz-*, *drəγvant-*, *pouru-mahrka-*, mairya-, *vīspō-mahrka-*, *skutara-*.

Angra Mainyu and Aēšma:
dušxᵛarənah-, duždā-.

Angra Mainyu and Dahāka:
duždaēna.

Angra Mainyu and Būšyąstā:
mairya.

Apąm Napāt: (10)
aurvaṭ-aspa-, *aršan-*, ahura-, upāpa-, xšaēta-, xša*θ*rya-, bərəzant-, sūrā-, *sruṭ-gaošōtəma-*, *zavanō-sū-*.

Apąm Napāt and Amәša Spəntas:
xšaēta-.

Apąm Napāt, Amәša Spəntas, "Arədvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Ahura-Mi*θ*ra, Tištrya, Fravašis, Mi*θ*ra, Rašnu, Sraoša, and Haoma:
bərəzant-.

Apąm Napāt, Aši, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Mi*θ*ra, Satavaēsa, and Sraoša:
sūra.

Apąm Napāt, Ahura Mazda, and Mi*θ*ra:
ahura-.

Apąm Napāt, Ahura Mazda, and Haoma:
xša*θ*rya-.

Apąm Napāt and Gandarəwa:
upāpa-.

Apąm Napāt and Hᵛarə:
aurvaṭ-aspa.

Aiwisrū*θ*rima: (1)
aibigā̆ya.

Ama: (2)
hutāšta-, huraoδa-.

Ama, "Arədvī," Aši, Drvāspā, Nairyō-Saᵚha, and Sraoša:
huraoδa-.

Ama and Miθra:
hutāšta-.
Aməša Spəntas:
aiθyaǰah-, *aiwyāma-*, āhuirya-, xšaēta-, taxma-, bərəzant-, *yavaēǰī-*, *yavaēsū-*, *vərəzi-dōiθra-*, *huxšaθra-*, *huδā-*, *hvarə-hazaoša-*.
Aməša Spəntas and Apąm Napāt:
xšaēta-.
Aməša Spəntas, Apąm Napāt, "Arədvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Ahura-Miθra, Tištrya, Fravašis, Miθra, Rašnu, Sraoša, and Haoma:
bərəzant-.
Aməša Spəntas, Ahura Mazda, Ātar, and Vāta:
huδā-.
Aməša Spəntas and Ahura-Miθra:
aiθyaǰah-.
Aməša Spəntas, Ātar, Dāmōiš Upamana, Fravašis, Miθra, Vayu, Vāta, and Sraoša:
taxma-.
Aməša Spəntas, Daēnā, and Sraoša:
āhuirya-.
Ayāθrima: (1)
fraourvaēštrima-, *varšniharšta-*.
"Arədvī": (19)
anāhita-, amavant-, aurvant-, *ahurō-ṭkaēša-*, *āδū-frāδana-*, xšōiθna-, *gaēθō-frāδana-*, *daiwhu-frāδana-*, pərəθu-frāka-, baēšazya-, *bāzu-staoyah-*, bərəzant-, *masita-*, *vqθwō-frāδana-*, vīdaēva-, sūra-, səvīšta-, *šaētō-frāδana-*, huraoδa-.
"Arədvī," Apąm Napāt, Aməša Spəntas, Aši, Ahura Mazda, Ahura-Miθra, Tištrya, Fravašis, Miθra, Rašnu, Sraoša, and Haoma:
bərəzant-.
"Arədvī," Ama,
"Arədvi," Ama, Aši, Drvāspā, Nairyō-Saŋha, and Sraoša:
huraoδa-.
"Arədvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Vanant, Haoma, and Haptō-Iringa:
baēšazya-.
"Arədvī," Aši, Ātar, Uparatāt, Ərəti, Čisti, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Paurvatāt, Fravašis, Miθra, Yazatas, Rašnu, Vanant, Vərəθraγna, and Sraoša:
amavant-.
"Arədvī," Aši, and Ušah:
xšōiθna-.
"Arədvī" and Ahura Mazda:
vīdaēva-.
"Arədvī," Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, and Miθra:
səvīšta-.
"Arədvī" and Daēnā:
pərəθu-frāka-.

"Arədvī," Miθra, and Haoma:
anāhita-.
"Arədvī" and Haoma:
aurvant-.
Airyaman: (1)
išya-.
Arštāt: (3)
frādaṭ-gaēθa-, *varədaṭ-gaēθa-*, *savō-gaēθa-*.
Arštāt, Aša, Ahura Mazda, Daēnā, Sraoša, and Haoma:
frādaṭ-gaēθa-.
Astō-Vīδātu: (2)
apairi-āya-, *zirijāh-*.
Aša: (6)
urvāsman-, frādaṭ-gaēθa-, *raoćahvant-*, sraēšta-, srīra-, *xᵛ̄nvant-*.
Aša, Arštāt, Ahura Mazda, Daēnā, Sraoša, and Haoma:
frādaṭ-gaēθa-.
Aša, Aši, Ārmaiti, Ušah, Tištrya, Daēnā, Vāta, Vohu Manah, and Haoma:
srīra-.
Aša and Ahura Mazda:
sraēšta-.
Aši: (25)
amavant-, *āfrasāhvant-*, xšōiθna-, *darəγō-vārəθman-*, dātō-saoka-, dāmiδāta, *pərəθvīra-*, pouru(š)-xᵛāθra-, baēšazya-, *bānumant-*, bərəzant-, *mazā-rayi-*, *mišāk-*, *rāsant-*, vyāvant, sūra-, spārō-dāšta-, srīra-, *hučiθra-*, huδāta-, *huyazata-*, huraoδa-, *hvō-aiwišak-*, xᵛanaṭ-čaxra-, xᵛāpara-.
Aši, Apąm Napāt, AməšaSpəntas, "Arədvī," Ahura Mazda, Ahura-Miθra, Tištrya, Fravašis, Miθra, Rašnu, Sraoša, and Haoma:
bərəzant-.
Aši, Apąm Napāt, "Arədvī," Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Miθra, Satavaēsa, and Haoma:
sūra-.
Aši, Ama, "Arədvī," Drvāspā, Nairyō-Saꞷha, and Sraoša:
huraoδa-.
Aši, "Arədvī," Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Vanant, Haoma, and Haptō-Iringa:
baēšazya-.
Aši, "Arədvī," Ātar, Uparatāt, Ərəti, Čisti, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Paurvatāt, Fravašis, Miθra, Yazatas, Rašnu, Vanant, Vərəθraγna, and Sraoša:
amavant-.
Aši, "Arədvī," and Ušah:
xšōiθna-.
Aši, Aša, Ārmaiti, Ušah, Tištrya, Daēnā, Vāta, Vohu Manah, and Haoma:
srīra-.
Aši, Ahura Mazda, and Rāman:
pouru(š)-xᵛāθra-.

Aši, Gəuš Urvan, Miθra, and Haoma:
dāmiδāta-.
Aši and Tištrya:
vyāvant-.
Aši and Drvāspā:
xᵛanaṭ-čaxra-.
Aši and Fravašis:
spārō-dāšta-, xᵛāpara-.
Aši and Miθra:
dātō-saoka-.
Aši, Miθra, and Haoma:
huδāta-.
Aži: (7)
aspō-gar-, nərə-gar-, vīšavant, vīšō-vaēpa-, sima-, srvara-, zairita-.
Ahura Mazda: (98)
aδaoya-, *aδaoyō-xratu-, *aδavi-, abaŋha-, *ava-tanuya-, *ava-nəmna-, ašaŋhac-, *aša-, *ašavan-, *ašavastəma-, *aša vahišta-, *ahura-, axᵛafna-, *āθravatəma-, *āθravan-, *išə-xšaθra-, *išə-xšaθryōtəma-, īžya-, xraoždišta-, *xratu-, *xratumant-, xraθwišta-, *xšaθrya-, *xšaθryōtəma-, xšayant-, *čisti-, *čištivant-, *θrātar-, daδvah-, *dātar-, *dūraēdarštar-, *dūraēdarəštəma-, *dūraēsūka-, *ṭbaēšō-taurvan-, *nąmo-xšaθra-, *nąmo-xšaθryōtəma-, *paitipāyu-, *pātar-, *pāyu-, *pouru-darštar-, *pouru-darštəma-, pouru-xᵛarənah-, *pouru(š)-xᵛāθra-, *fraxštya-, frādaṭ-gaēθa-, *fšūmant-, *fšūše-mąθra-, *baēšazya-, *baēšazyōtəma-, bərəzant, *mainyu spəntōtəma, mazišta-, *mazdāh-, raēvant-, ratuxšaθra-, rapant-, vaŋhu-dāh, vahišta-, *vąθwya-, *vītar-, vīdaēva-, *vīdvaēštva-, vīdvant-, *vīδavi-, **vīspataš-, *vīspavanya-, *vīspa vohu mazdaδāta ašačiθra-, *vīspa-xvāθra-, *vīspa-hišat-, vīspōvīδvant-, vouru-rafnah-, vohumant-, vərəθrajan-, *vərəzi-saoka-, *vərəzi-savah-, *sūra-, *səvin-, *səvīšta-, *spanahvant-, *spaštar-, *spānah-, *sraēšta-, *žnātar-, *žnōišta-, *haθravanya-, *hātamarəni-, hukərəptəma-, huxšaθrōtəma-, *hudānu-, *hudāmuštəma-, huδāman-, huδā-, humāya-, hvāpah-, *xvarənaŋuhastəma-, *xvarənaŋhan-, xᵛarəhvant-, *xvāθravant.
Ahura Mazda, Apąm Napāt, Amәša Spəntas, "Arədvī," Aši, Ahura-Miθra, Tištrya, Fravašis, Miθra, Rašnu, Sraoša, and Haoma:
bərəzant-.
Ahura Mazda, Apąm Napāt, Aši, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Miθra, Satavaēsa, and Sraoša:
sūra-.
Ahura Mazda, Apąm Napāt, and Miθra:
ahura-.
Ahura Mazda, Apąm Napāt, and Haoma:
xšaθrya-.

Ahura Mazda, Amәša Spәntas, Ātar, and Vāta:
huδā-.
Ahura Mazda and "Arәdvī":
vīdaēva-.
Ahura Mazda, "Arәdvī," Aši, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Vanant, Haoma, and Haptō-Iringa:
baēšazya-.
Ahura Mazda, "Arәdvī," Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, and Miθra:
sәvīšta-.
Ahura Mazda, Arštāt, Aša, Daēnā, Sraoša, and Haoma:
frādaṭ-gaēθa-.
Ahura Mazda and Aša:
sraēšta-.
Ahura Mazda, Aši, and Rāman:
pouru(š)-xᵛāθra-.
Ahura Mazda, Ātar, Yazatas, and Xᵛarәnah:
pouru-xᵛarәnah-.
Ahura Mazda, Ušah, Fravašis, and Haδiš:
xᵛāθravant-.
Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, and Fravašis:
dūraē-sūka-.
Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Māh, Miθra, and Satavaēsa:
raēvant-.
Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Māh, and Satavaēsa:
xᵛarәnahvant-.
Ahura Mazda and Daēnā:
vouru-rafnah-.
Ahura Mazda, Daēnā, and Miθra:
mazišta-.
Ahura Mazda and Drvāspā:
θrātar-.
Ahura Mazda, Fravašis, Vāta, Sraoša, and Haoma:
vәrәθraǰan-.
Ahura Mazda and Miθra:
aδaoya-, xšayant-, vīspō-vīδvant-.
Ahura Mazda, Miθra, and Hąm-varәti:
axᵛafna-.
Ahura Mazda and Yazatas:
vaŋhu-dāh-.
Ahura Mazda and Rašnu:
dūraēdarәštәma-.
Ahura Mazda and Spәnta Mainyu:
daδvah-.
Ahura-Miθra: (2)
aiθyaǰah-, bәrәzant-.

Ahura-Miθra, Apąm Napāt, Aməša Spəntas, "Arədvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Fravašis, Miθra, Rašnu, Sraoša, and Haoma:
bərəzant-.

Ahura-Miθra and Aməša Spəntas:
aiθyaǰah-.

Āxsti: (1)
hąm-vainti-.

Ātar: (17)
aoxtō-nāman-, aoǰahvant-, amavant-, *ašā-aoǰah-*, *upa-suxta-*, taxma-, nmānō-paiti-, pouru-baēšaza-, pouru-xᵛarənah-, mazdaδāta-, raoxšna-, raθaēštar-, vyāxana-, *saoćinavant-*, *suxra-*, spənta-, huδā-.

Ātar, Aməša Spəntas, Ahura Mazda, and Vāta:
huδā-.

Ātar, Aməša Spəntas, Dāmōiš Upamana, Fravašis, Miθra, Vayu, Vāta, and Sraoša:
taxma-.

Ātar, "Arədvī," Aši, Uparatāt, Ərəti, Čisti, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Paurvatāt, Fravašis, Miθra, Yazatas, Rašnu, Vanant, Vərəθraγna, and Sraoša:
amavant-.

Ātar, Ahura Mazda, Yazatas, and Xᵛarənah:
pouru-xᵛarənah-.

Ātar, Xšaθra, Fravašis, and Sraoša:
aoǰahvant-.

Ātar, Čistā, Daēnā, Drvāspā, Rātā, Vanant, Vāta, Vərəθraγna, Saokā, Saokənta, Satavaēsa, Savah, Haoma, and Xᵛarənah:
mazdaδāta-.

Ātar and Tištrya:
raoxšna-.

Ātar, Miθra, Vanant, and Sraoša:
aoxtō-nāman-.

Ātar, Miθra, and Sraoša:
raθaēštar-.

Ātar, Nairyō-Saṇha, and Miθra:
vyāxana-.

Ātar, Fravašis, and Vāta:
spənta-.

Ātar and Yazatas:
pouru-baēšaza-.

Ātar and Haoma:
nmānō-paiti-.

Āfriti: (1)
daŋma-.

Ārmaiti: (5)
dāmi-, friθa-, *bərəxδa-*, srīra-, *hušyaoθana-*.

Ārmaiti, Aša, Aši, Ušah, Tištrya, Daēnā, Vāta, Vohu Manah, and Haoma:
srīra-.

Ārmaiti and Sraoša:
fri*θ*a-.
Āzi: (1)
daēvō-dāta-.
Āzi, Vīδātu, and Zyąm:
daēvō-dāta-.
Uparatāt: (2)
amavant-, *vanant-*.
Uparatāt, "Arədvī," Aši, Ātar, Ərəti, Čisti, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Paurvatāt, Fravašis, Mi*θ*ra, Yazatas, Rašnu, Vanant, Vərə*θ*raγna, and Sraoša:
amavant-.
Ušah: (9)
xšōi*θ*na-, *nmānyant-*, framən-nar, framən-narō-vīra, raγu-, *ranjaṭ-aspa-*, *ravaṭ-aspa-*, srīra, xᵛā*θ*ravant-.
Ušah, "Arədvī," and Aši:
xšōi*θ*na-.
Ušah, Aša, Aši, Ārmaiti, Tištrya, Daēnā, Vāta, Vohu Manah, and Haoma:
srīra-.
Ušah, Ahura Mazda, Fravašis, and Haδiš:
xᵛā*θ*ravant-.
Ušah, Pārəndi, and Fravašis:
raγu-.
Ušah and Hąm-Varəti:
framən-nar-, framən-narō-vīra-.
Ərəti: (1)
amavant-.
Ərəti, "Arədvī," Aši, Ātar, Uparatāt, Čisti, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Paurvatāt, Fravašis, Mi*θ*ra, Yazatas, Rašnu, Vanant, Vərə*θ*raγna, and Sraoša:
amavant-.
Xša*θ*ra: (2)
aoǰahvant-, *xᵛāng-darəsa-*.
Xsa*θ*ra, Ātar, Fravašis, and Sraoša:
aoǰahvant-.
Gandarəwa: (2)
upāpa, *zairi-pāšna-*.
Gandarəwa and Apąm Napāt:
upāpa-.
Gāuš Urvan: (1)
dāmiδāta-.
Gāuš Urvan, Aši, Mi*θ*ra, and Haoma:
dāmiδāta-.
Čistā: (13)
āsu-kairya-, *nimarəzišta-*, frasrūta-, *baraṭ-zao*θ*ra-*, mazda-δāta-, *mošu-kairya-*, razišta-, *spačta-*, *huaiwitačina-*, *hunaravant-*, *hupa-*θ*mainya-*, hvāyaona-, *hvāyaozda-*.
Čistā, Ātar, Daēnā, Drvāspā, Rātā, Vanant, Vāta, Vərə*θ*raγna, Saokā,

Saokənta, Satavaēsa, Savah, Haoma, and Xᵛarənah:
mazdaδāta-.

Čistā, Fravašis, and Miθra:
frasrūta-.

Čistā and Rašnu:
razišta-.

Čistā and Vərəθraγna:
hvāyaona-.

Čisti: (1)
amavant-.

Čisti, "Arədvī," Aši, Ātar, Uparatāt, Ərəti, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Paurvatāt, Fravašis, Miθra, Yazatas, Rašnu, Vanant, Vərəθraγna, and Sraoša:
amavant-.

Tištrya: (25)
afščiθra-, amavant-, *āsu-xšvaēva-*, uparō-kairya-, xšayamna-, *xšvivivāza-*, θamnahvant-, dūraē-sūka-, *drvō-čašman-*, *frādərəsra-*, baēšazya-, bərəzant-, yaoxštivant-, raēvant-, raoxšna-, ravōfraoθman-, *rāmanivant-*, rāma-šayana-, varəčahvant-, vyāvant-, sūra-, səvīšta-, srīra-, hušayana-, xᵛarənahvant-.

Tištrya, Apąm Napāt, Amәša Spəntas, Aši, Ahura Mazda, Ahura-Miθra, Fravašis, Miθra, Rašnu, Sraoša, and Haoma:
bərəzant-.

Tištrya, Apąm Napāt, Aši, Ahura Mazda, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Miθra, Satavaēsa, and Sraoša:
sūra-.

Tištrya, "Arədvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Vanant, Haoma, and Haptō-Iringa:
baēšazya-.

Tištrya, "Arədvī," Aši, Ātar, Uparatāt, Ərəti, Čisti, Drvāspā, Paurvatāt, Fravašis, Miθra, Yazatas, Rašnu, Vanant, Vərəθraγna, and Sraoša:
amavant-.

Tištrya, "Arədvī," Ahura Mazda, Drvāspā, Fravašis, and Miθra:
səvīšta-.

Tištrya, Aša, Aši, Ārmaiti, Ušah, Daēnā, Vāta, Vohu Manah, and Haoma:
srīra-.

Tištrya and Aši:
vyāvant-.

Tištrya, Ahura Mazda, and Fravašis:
dūraē-sūka-.

Tištrya, Ahura Mazda, Māh, Miθra, and Satavaēsa:
raēvant-.

Tištrya, Ahura Mazda, Māh, and Satavaēsa:
xᵛarənahvant-.

Tištrya and Ātar:
raoxšna-.

Tištrya and Fravašis:
ravō-fraoθman-.

Tištrya, Fravašis, Vayu, and Xᵛarənah:
uparō-kairya-.
Tištrya, Māh, Miθra, and Xᵛarənah:
yaoxštivant-.
Tištrya, Māh, and Xᵛarənah:
varəčahvant-.
Tištrya and Miθra:
xšayamna-, rāma-šayana-, hušayana-.
Tištrya and Xᵛarənah:
θamnahvant-.
Θwāša: (2)
uγra-, xᵛaδāta-.
Θwāša, Dāmōiš Upamana, Fravašis, Miθra, Vayu, Hąm-Varəti, and Xᵛarənah:
uγra-.
Θwāša and Raočah:
xᵛaδāta-.
Daēnā: (17)
āhuirya-, *niδāsnaiθiš-*, pərəθu-frāka-, *fraspāyaoxəδra-*, frādaṭ-gaēθa-, mazišta-, mazdaδāta-, *mazdayasnya-*, *vīspō-afsman-*, *vīspō-vərəzya-*, *vīspō-hankərəθya-*, vouru-rafnah-, *sraota-gaoša-*, srīra-, *zaraθustri-*, *hačaṭ-aša-*, *xᵛaētvadaθa-*.
Daēnā, Amәša Spəntas, and Sraoša:
āhuirya-.
Daēnā and "Arədvī":
pərəθu-frāka-.
Daēnā, Arštāt, Aša, Ahura Mazda, Sraoša, and Haoma:
frādaṭ-gaēθa-.
Daēnā, Aša, Aši, Ārmaiti, Ušah, Tištrya, Vāta, Vohu Manah, and Haoma:
srīra-.
Daēnā and Ahura Mazda:
vouru-rafnah-.
Daēnā, Ahura Mazda, and Miθra:
mazišta-.
Daēnā, Ātar, Čistā, Drvāspā, Rātā, Vanant, Vāta, Vərəθraγna, Saokā, Saokənta, Satavaēsa, Savah, Haoma, and Xᵛarənah:
mazdaδāta-.
Dahāka: (6)
aγa-daēna-, *xšvaš-aši-*, *θrikamərəδa-*, *θrizafan-*, duždaēna-, hazaŋra-yaoxšti-.
Dahāka and Angra Mainyu:
duždaēna-.
Dahāka and Miθra:
hazaŋra-yaoxšti-.
Dāmōiš Upamana: (2)
uγra-, taxma-.

Dāmōiš Upamana, Amәša Spәntas, Ātar, Fravašis, Miθra, Vayu, Vāta, and Sraoša:

taxma-.

Dāmōiš Upamana, Θwāša, Fravašis, Miθra, Vayu, Hąm-Varәti, and Xᵛarәnah:

uγra-.

Druǰ: (7)

aka-, ašaoǰah-, ahūm-mәrәnk-, tәmaᵛhaēna-, daēva-, duščiθra-, bizәᵛrōčiθra-.

Drvāspā: (21)

amavant-, θrātar-, *darәγō-haxәδrayana-, drvō-apәrәnāyuka-, drvō-urvaθa-, drvō-pasu-, drvō-varәta-, drvō-staora-, drvō-staiti-, pouruspaxšti-, fšaoni-marәza-*, bačšazya-, mazdaδāta-, *yuxta-aspa-, varәtōraθa-*, sūra-, sәvīšta-, huraoδa-, xᵛanaṭ-čaxra-, *xᵛāθravana-, xᵛāsaoka-.*

Drvāspā, Apąm Napāt, Aši, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Fravašis, Miθra, Satavaēsa, and Sraoša:

sūra-.

Drvāspā, Ama, "Arәdvī," Aši, Nairyō-Saᵛha, and Sraoša:

huraoδa-.

Drvāspā, "Arәdvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Fravašis, Vanant, Haoma, and Haptō-Iringa:

baēšazya-.

Drvāspā, "Arәdvī," Aši, Ātar, Uparatāt, Ǝrәti, Čisti, Tištrya, Paurvatāt, Fravašis, Miθra, Yazatas, Rašnu, Vanant, Vәrәθraγna, and Sraoša:

amavant-.

Drvāspā, "Arәdvī," Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Fravašis, and Miθra:

sәvīšta-.

Drvāspā and Aši:

xᵛanaṭ-čaxra-.

Drvāspā and Ahura Mazda:

θrātar-.

Drvāspā, Ātar, Čistā, Daēnā, Rātā, Vanant, Vāta, Vәrәθraγna, Saokā, Saokәnta, Satavaēsa, Savah, Haoma, and Xᵛarәnah:

mazdaδāta-.

Nairyō-Saᵛha: (4)

xšaθrō-naptar-, māyu-, vyāxana-, huraoδa-.

Nairyō-Saᵛha, Ama, "Arәdvī," Aši, Drvāspā, and Sraoša:

huraoδa-.

Nairyō-Saᵛha, Ātar, and Miθra:

vyāxana-.

Paurvatāt: (1)

amavant-.

Paurvatāt, "Arәdvī," Aši, Ātar, Uparatāt, Ǝrәti, Čisti, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Miθra, Yazatas, Rašnu, Vanant, Vәrәθraγna, and Sraosa:

amavant-.

Pārəndi: (2)
raoraθa-, raγu-.
Pārəndi, Ušah, and Fravašis:
raγu-.
Fravašis: (68)
aoǰahvant-, *aoǰišta-*, *anā-mąθwa-*, aiwiθūra-, amavant, *ayō-xaoδa-*, *ayō-vərəθra-*, *ayō-zaya-*, *airime-aŋhaδ-*, arədra-, *arəzayant-*, *avi-ama-*, *aš-bərət-*, *āsno-urvan-*, uγra-, *uγra-zaoša-*, *uγrārət-*, uparō-kairya-, *urvinyant-*, *uzgərəptō-drafša-*, *xrvišyant-*, gufra-, taxma, *taxmārət-*, tančišta-, *tušnišad-*, *darəγō-rąrōman-*, *dasaθavant-*, dūraē-sūka-, dərəzra-, *pərəθu-yaona-*, *pouru-spāδa-*, *frasčandayant-*, frasrūta-, baēšazya-, *bāmya-*, bərəzant-, bərəzyāsta-, *yāskərət-*, *yāskərəstəma-*, *yāstō-zayah-*, raγu-, ravō-fraoθman-, *rąrəma-*, *rənǰišta-*, *vanaṭ-pəšana-*, *vasō-yaona-*, *vazārət-*, *vārəθraγna-*, *vīčira-*, *vīvāyant-*, vərəθraǰan-, *vərəzi-čašman-*, sūra-, səvīšta-, spārō-dāšta-, spənta-, spəništa-, *sraotanu*, *sraoθra-*, *sravašəmna-*, *zaoyārət-*, ham-varəitivant, *hudōiθra-*, *huyaona-*, *hvārət-*, xᵛāθravant-, xᵛāpara-.
Fravašis, Apąm Napāt, Amәša Spəntas, "Arədvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Ahura-Miθra, Tištrya, Miθra, Rašnu, Sraoša, and Haoma:
bərəzant-.
Fravašis, Apąm Napāt, Aši, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Miθra, Satavaēsa, and Sraoša:
sūra-.
Fravašis, Amәša Spəntas, Ātar, Dāmōiš Upamana, Miθra, Vāta, Vayu, and Sraoša:
taxma-.
Fravašis, "Arədvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Vanant, Haoma, and Haptō-Iringa:
baēšazya-.
Fravašis, "Arədvī," Aši, Ātar, Uparatāt, Ərəti, čisti, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Paurvatāt, Miθra, Yazatas, Rašnu, Vanant, Vərəθraγna, and Sraoša:
amavant-.
Fravašis, "Arədvī," Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, and Miθra:
səvīšta-.
Fravašis and Aši:
spārō-dāšta-, xᵛāpara-.
Fravašis, Ahura Mazda, Ušah, and Haδiš:
xᵛāθravant-.
Fravašis, Ahura Mazda, and Tištrya:
dūraē-sūka-.
Fravašis, Ahura Mazda, Vāta, Sraoša, and Haoma:
vərəθraǰan-.
Fravašis, Ātar, Xšaθra, and Sraoša:
aoǰahvant-.
Fravašis, Ātar, and Vāta:
spənta-.

Fravašis, Ušah, and Pārəndi:
raγu-.
Fravašis, Čistā, and Miθra:
frasrūta-.
Fravašis and Tištrya:
ravō-fraoθman-.
Fravašis, Tištrya, Vayu, and Xᵛarənah:
uparō-kairya-.
Fravašis, Θwāša, Dāmōiš Upamana, Miθra, Vayu, Hąm-Varəti, and Xᵛarənah:
uγra-.
Fravašis and Miθra:
aiwiθūra-, arədra-, gufra-, bərəzyāsta-.
Fravašis and Rašnu:
spəništa-.
Fravašis and Vayu:
dərəzra-.
Fravašis and Sraoša:
hąm-varəitivant-.
Fravašis and Haoma:
tančišta-.
Būšyąstā: (3)
darəγō-gava-, mairya-, *zairina-*.
Būšyąstā and Angra Mainyu:
mairya-.
Maiδyāirya: (1)
sarəδā-.
Maiδyōi-šam: (1)
vāstrō-dātainya-.
Maiδyōi-zarəmaya: (1)
payah-.
Māh: (14)
afnahvant-, *ištavant-*, *xštāvant-*, *gaočiθra-*, *tafnahvant-*, *baēšaza-*, yaoxštivant-, raēvant-, *raočinavant-*, varəčahvant-, *vohvāvant-*, *saokavant-*, *zairimyāvant-*, xᵛarənahvant-.
Māh, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Miθra, and Sataνaēsa:
raēvant-.
Māh, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, and Sataνaēsa:
xᵛarənahvant-.
Māh, Tištrya, Miθra, and Xᵛarənah:
yaoxštivant-.
Māh, Tištrya, and Xᵛarənah:
varəčahvant-.
Mąθra: (2)
vərəzyaⱻhva, *haomačana*.

Mąθra and Ząm:
vərəzyaⱴhva.

Miθra: (100)
aoxtō-nāman-, *aoǰah-*, *aγrya-*, aδaoya-, *aδaoyamna-*, *aδairi-dahyu-*, *anaiwi-druxta-*, anāhita-, *antarə-dahyu-*, *aipi-dahyu-*, aiwiθūra-, *aiwi-dahyu-*, amavant-, *amiθwa-*, *auruša-*, *aurušāspa-*, arədra-, *arənaṭ-čaēša-*, *arš-vačah-*, *ašavastō-dā-*, *ašahunara-*, *aštraⱴhāδ-*, ahura, axᵛafna-, *ādahyu-*, āsu-, *āzuiti-dā-*, uxšaṭ-urvara-, uγra-, *uγra-bāzu-*, *upairi-dahyu-*, *uparō-nmāna-*, ərəδwō-zənga-, *ərəzatō-frašna-*, *karšō-razah-*, *xšaθrō-dā-*, xšayant-, xšayamna-, *xšviviišu-*, *gayō-dā-*, gufra-, ǰaγāurvah-, taxma-, taṭ-ap-, tanumąθra-, tiži-aršti-, *tižinavant-*, *tižvant-*, daiⱴhu-paiti-, *darəγa-aršaya-*, dātō-saoka-, dāmiδāta-, *pairi-dahyu-*, *parō-kəvīd-*, *puθro-dā-*, *pərəθuvaēδayana-*, *pouru-yaoxšti-*, *fraxšti-dā-*, *fraṭ-āp-*, frasrūta-, *baēvarəčašman-*, *baēvarə-spasana-*, bāzuš-aoǰah-, bərəzant-, bərəzyāsta-, mazišta-, yaoxštivant-, raēvant-, raθaēštar-, rāma-šayana-, *vasō-*, *gaoyaoiti-*, *vasō-yāna-*, *vahmō-səndah-*, *vąθwō-dā-*, *vindaṭ-spāδa-*vīspaiti-, vīspō-vīδvant-, *vouru-gaoyaoiti-*, *vərəθravant-*, vyāxana-, sūra-, səvīšta-, *spas-*, *sruṭ-gaoša-*, *zaēnahvant-*, *zaranyō-vārəθman-*, zavanō-srūt-, *zavanō-svan-*, *havaⱴhō-dā-*, *hazaⱴra-gaoša-*, hazaⱴrayaoxšti-, hutāšta-, huδāta-, *hunairyδnk-*, *hurāθya-*, hušayana-, *huzaēna-*, *hvaspa-*, *hvāmaržδika-*, *xvarənō-dā-*.

Miθra, Apąm Napāt, Amәša Spәntas, "Arədvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Ahura-Miθra, Tištrya, Fravašis, Rašnu, Sraoša, and Haoma:
bərəzant-.

Miθra, Apąm Napāt, Aši, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Satavaēsa, and Sraoša:
sūra-.

Miθra, Apąm Napāt, and Ahura Mazda:
ahura-.

Miθra and Ama:
hutāšta-.

Miθra, Amәša Spәntas, Ātar, Dāmōiš Upamana, Miθra, Vayu, Vāta, and Sraoša:
taxma-.

Miθra, "Arədvī," Aši, Ātar, Uparatāt, Ərəti, Čisti, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Paurvatāt, Fravašis, Yazatas, Rašnu, Vanant, Vərəθraγna, and Sraoša:
amavant-.

Miθra, "Arədvī," Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, and Fravašis:
səvīšta-.

Miθra, "Arədvī," and Haoma:
anāhita-.

Miθra and Aši:
dātō-saoka-.

Miθra, Aši, Gәuš Urvan, and Haoma:
dāmiδāta-.

Miθra, Aši, and Haoma:
huδāta-.
Miθra and Ahura Mazda:
aδaoya-, axᵛafna-, xšayant-, vīspō-vīδvant-.
Miθra, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Māh, and Satavaēsa:
raēvant-.
Miθra, Ahura Mazda, and Daēnā:
mazišta-.
Miθra, Ātar, and Nairyō-Saɯha:
vyāxana-.
Miθra, Ātar, Vanant, and Sraoša:
aoxtō-nāman-.
Miθra, Ātar, and Sraoša:
raθaēštar-.
Miθra, Čistā, and Fravašis:
frasrūta-.
Miθra and Tištrya:
xšayamna-, rāma-šayana-, hušayana-.
Miθra, Tištrya, Māh, and Xᵛarənah:
yaoxštivant-.
Miθra, Θwāša, Dāmōiš Upamana, Fravašis, Vayu, Hąm-Varəti, and Xᵛarənah:
uγra-.
Miθra and Dahāka:
hazaɯra-yaoxšti-.
Miθra and Fravašis:
aiwiθūra-, arədra-, gufra-, bərəzyāsta-.
Miθra and Vayu:
tiži-aršti-.
Miθra and Satavaēsa:
uxšaṭ-urvara-, taṭ-āp-, zavanō-srūt-.
Miθra and Sraoša:
āsu-, tanumąθra-, bāzuš-aoǰah-.
Miθra and Haoma:
daiɯhu-paiti-, vīspaiti-.
Miθra and Hąm-Varəti:
axᵛafnya-, ərəδwō-zənga-, ǰaγāurvah-.
Yazatas: (4)
amaṽant-, pouru-baēšaza-, pouru-xᵛarənah-, vaɯhu-dā-.
Yazatas, "Arədvī," Aši, Ātar, Uparatāt, Ərəti, Čisti, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Paurvatāt, Fravašis, Miθra, Rašnu, Vanant, Vərəθraγna, and Sraoša:
amavant-.
Yazatas and Ahura Mazda:
vaɯhu-dā-.

Yazatas, Ahura Mazda, Ātar, and Xᵛarənah:
pouru-xᵛarənah-.
Yazatas and Ātar:
pouru-baēšaza-.
Raočah: (2)
anaγra-, xᵛaδāta-.
Raočah and Θwāša:
xᵛaδāta-.
Rašnu: (10)
amavant-, *arš-ṭkaēša-*, *upa-raoδišta-*, duraēdarəštəma-, *parakavistəma-*, bərəzant-, razišta-, *vaēδišta-*, *viδčōišta-*, spəništa-.
Rašnu, Apąm Napāt, Amәša Spəntas, "Arədvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Ahura-Miθra, Tištrya, Fravašis, Miθra, Sraoša, and Haoma:
bərəzant-.
Rašnu, "Arədvī," Aši, Ātar, Uparatāt, Ərəti, Čisti, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Paurvatāt, Fravašis, Miθra, Yazatas, Vanant, Vərəθraγna, and Sraoša:
amavant-.
Rašnu and Ahura Mazda:
duraēdarəštəma-.
Rašnu and Čistā:
razišta-.
Rašnu and Fravašis:
spəništa-.
Rātā: (2)
mazdaδāta-, vouru-dōiθra-.
Rātā, Ātar, Čistā, Daēnā, Drvāspā, Vanant, Vāta, Vərəθraγna, Saokā, Saokəṇta, Satavaēsa, Savah, Haoma, and Xᵛarənah:
mazdaδāta-.
Rātā and Saokā:
vouru-dōiθra-.
Rāman: (2)
pouru(š)-xᵛāθra-, *xᵛāstra-*.
Rāman, Aši, and Ahura Mazda:
pouru(š)-xᵛāθra-.
Vanant: (4)
aoxtō-nāman-, amavant-, baēšazya-, mazdaδāta-.
Vanant, "Arədvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Haoma, and Haptō-Iringa:
baēšazya-.
Vanant, "Arədvī," Aši, Ātar, Uparatāt, Ərəti, Čisti, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Paurvatāt, Fravašis, Miθra, Yazatas, Rašnu, Vərəθraγna, and Sraoša:
amavant-.
Vanant, Ātar, Čistā, Daēnā, Drvāspā, Rātā, Vāta, Vərəθraγna, Saokā,

Saokənta, Satavaēsa, Savah, Haoma, and Xᵛarənah:
mazdaδāta-.

Vanant, Ātar, Miθra, and Sraoša:
aoxtō-nāman-.

Vaya: (1)
anamarəždika.

Vayah: (1)
darəγō-xᵛaδāta-.

Vayah and Zrvan:
darəγō-xᵛaδāta-.

Vayu: (62)
**aojin-, *aojis-, anāxᵛrviδa-dōiθra-, *apayata(r?)-, *aipičara(r?)-, *aipiδbaoγa-, *aiwi-xᵛarənah-,* *aurva-, **arvōtəma-, *āinivan-, *āyaoza-,* uγra-, uparō-kairya-, *uskāṭ-yāsta-, *karədarəsa-, *gərəδa-, *gərəδixava-, *gərəδyaoxa-,* *taxma-, **taxmōtəma-, *tarō-ṭbaēša-,* *tiži-aršti-, **tižyaršt(?)-, *darəzišta-, *dahaka-, dərəzi-yaoxəδra-,* *dərəzra-, **ṭbaēšō-tara-, *nispā-, *pāyaoza-, pərəθu-varah-, pərəθu-sraoni-, *pərəθvarəšta(r?)-, *pərəθvarəšti-, *fračara-, *fraspā-, *buxti-, *bučahin-, *vaēžyaršta(r?)-, *vaēžyaršti-, *vanō-vīspa-, *vidaēvō-kara-, *vindixᵛarənah-, *vivaoza-, *vīdaka-, *vohvaršta(r?)-, *saočahin-, *saiδi-, zaranyō-aoθra-, zaranyō-aiwyå̊hana-, zaranyō-xaoδa-, zaranyō-čaxra-, zaranyō-pusa-, zaranyō-mina-, zaranyō-vastra-, zaranyō-vāša-, zaranyō-zaya-, *zinaka-, *haθravana-, *hupairitan-, *hupairispā-, *xᵛarənah-.*

Vayu, Amәša Spəntas, Ātar, Dāmōiš Upamana, Fravašis, Miθra, Vāta, and Sraoša:
taxma-.

Vayu, Tištrya, Fravašis, and Xᵛarənah:
uparō-kairya-.

Vayu, Θwāša, Dāmōiš Upamana, Fravašis, Miθra, Hąm-Varəti, and Xᵛarənah:
uγra-.

Vayu and Fravašis:
dərəzra-.

Vayu and Miθra:
tiži-aršti-.

Vayu and Haoma:
aurva-.

Vāta: (7)
taxma-, *darši-*, mazdaδāta-, vərəθraǰan-, spənta-, srīra-, huδā-.

Vāta, Amәša Spəntas, Ahura Mazda, and Ātar:
huδā-.

Vāta, Amәša Spəntas, Ātar, Dāmōiš Upamana, Fravašis, Miθra, Vayu, and Sraoša:
taxma-.

Vāta, Aša, Aši, Ārmaiti, Ušah, Tištrya, Daēnā, Vohu Manah, and Haoma:
srīra-.

Vāta, Ahura Mazda, Fravašis, Sraoša, and Haoma:
vərəθraǰan-.

Vāta, Ātar, Čistā, Daēnā, Drvāspā, Rātā, Vanant, Vərəθraγna, Saokā, Saokənta, Satavaēsa, Savah, Haoma, and Xᵛarənah:
mazdadāta-.

Vāta, Ātar, and Fravašis:
spənta-.

Vāsī: (1)
pančа-sadvara-.

Vīδātu: (1)
daēvō-dāta-.

Vīδātu, Āzi, and Zyąm:
daēvō-dāta-.

Vərəθraγna: (10)
amavant-, *aršō-kara-*, *ahuradāta-*, *frašō-kara-*, *barō-xᵛarənah*, *maršō-kara-*, mazdadāta-, *vərəθravan-*, *hvāxšta-*, hvāyaona-.

Vərəθraγna, " Arədvī," Aši, Ātar, Uparatāt, Ərəti, Čisti, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Paurvatāt, Fravašis, Miθra, Yazatas, Rašnu, Vanant, and Sraoša:
amavant-.

Vərəθraγna, Ātar, Čistā, Daēnā, Drvāspā, Rātā, Vanant, Vāta, Saokā, Saokənta, Satavaēsa, Savah, Haoma, and Xᵛarənah:
mazdadāta-.

Vərəθraγna and Čistū:
hvāyaona-.

Vohu Manah: (2)
varəzayant-, srīra-.

Vohu Manah, Aša, Aši, Ārmaiti, Ušah, Tištrya, Daēnā, Vāta, and Haoma:
srīra-.

Saokā: (5)
θrąfəδa-, *baraṭ-avarəta-*, *baraṭ-āyapta-*, mazdadāta-, vouru-dōiθra-.

Saokā, Ātar, Čistā, Daēnā, Drvāspā, Rātā, Vanant, Vāta, Vərəθraγna, Saokənta, Satavaēsa, Savah, Haoma, and Xᵛarənah:
mazdadāta-.

Saokā and Rātā:
vouru-dōiθra-.

Saokənta: (1)
mazdadāta-.

Saokənta, Ātar, Čistā, Daēnā, Drvāspā, Rātā, Vanant, Vāta, Vərəθraγna, Saokā, Satavaēsa, Savah, Haoma, and Xᵛarənah:
mazdadāta-.

Satavaēsa: (8)
uxšaṭ-urvara-, taṭ-āp-, *frāpa-*, mazdadāta-, raēvant-, sūra-, **zavanō-srūt-**, **xᵛarənahvant-**.

Satavaēsa, Apąm Napāt, Aši, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Miθra, and Sraoša:
sūra-.

Satavaēsa, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, and Māh:
xᵛarənahvant-.

Satavaēsa, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Māh, and Miθra:
raēvant-.

Satavaēsa, Ātar, Čistā, Daēnā, Drvāspā, Rātā, Vanant, Vāta, Vərəθraγna, Saokā, Saokənta, Savah, Haoma, and Xᵛarənah:
mazdaδāta-.

Satavaēsa and Miθra:
uxšaṭ-urvara-, taṭ-āp-, zavanō-srūt-.

Savah: (1)
mazdaδāta-.

Savah, Ātar, Čistā, Daēnā, Drvāspā, Rātā, Vanant, Vāta, Vərəθraγna, Saokā, Saokənta, Satavaēsa, Haoma, and Xᵛarənah:
mazdaδāta-.

Snāviδka: (2)
asəngō-gav-, *srvō-zana-*.

Spənta Mainyu: (1)
daδvah-.

Spənta Mainyu and Ahura Mazda:
daδvah-.

Sraoša: (24)
aoxtō-nāman-, aoǰahvant-, amavant-, ašivant-, *ašya-*, āsu-, āhuirya-, taxma-, tanumąθra-, *daršita-*, *darši-dru-*, frādaṭ-gačθą, friθa-, *frya-*, bāzuš-aoǰah-, *bərəzi-δā-*, bərəzant-, raθaēštar-, *vanaitivant-*, *vispō-mazišta-*, vərəθraǰan-, sūra-, hąm-varəitivant-, huraoδa-.

Sraoša, Apąm Napāt, Amәša Spəntas, "Arədvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Ahura-Miθra, Tištrya, Fravašis, Miθra, Rašnu, and Haoma:
bərəzant-.

Sraoša, Apąm Napāt, Aši, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Miθra, and Satavaēsa:
sūra-.

Sraoša, Ama, "Arədvī," Aši, Drvāspā, and Nairyō-Saŋha:
huraoδa-.

Sraoša, Amәša Spəntas, Ātar, Dāmōiš Upamana, Fravašis, Miθra, Vayu, and Vāta:
taxma-.

Sraoša, Amәša Spəntas, and Daēnā:
āhuirya-.

Sraoša, "Arədvī," Aši, Ātar, Uparatāt, Ꞑəti, Čisti, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Paurvatāt, Fravašis, Miθra, Yazatas, Rašnu, Vanant, and Vərəθraγna:
amavant-.

Sraoša, Arštāt, Aša, Ahura Mazda, Daēnā, and Haoma:
frādaṭ-gaēθa-.

Sraoša, Ahura Mazda, Fravašis, Vāta, and Haoma:
vərəθrajan-.
Sraoša, Ātar, Xšaθra, and Fravašis:
aojahvant-.
Sraoša, Ātar, and Miθra:
raθaēštar-.
Sraoša, Ātar, Miθra, and Vanant:
aoxtō-nāman-.
Sraoša and Ārmaiti:
friθa-.
Sraoša and Fravašis:
hąm-varəitivant-.
Sraoša and Miθra:
āsu-, tanumąθra-, bāzuš-aojah-.
Sraoša and Haδiš:
ašivant-.
Zaurvan: (1)
dužδąfəδra-.
Zyąm: (1)
daēvō-dāta-.
Zyąm, Āzi, and Vīdātu-:
daēvō-dāta-.
Zrvan: (2)
akarana-, darəγō-xᵛaδāta-.
Zrvan and Vayah:
darəγō-xᵛaδāta-.
Haoma: (33)
anāhita-, aurvā-, aurvant-, *aršdāta-*, *ašavazah-*, xšaθrya-, *gaoman-*, tančišta-, *θwaxša-*, daiwhu-paiti-, dāmiδāta-, *dūraoša-*, *nąmyąsu-*, nmānō-paiti-, *pāθmainyōtəma-*, *pouru-sarəδa-*, frādaṭ-gaēθa-, *frāšmi-*, baēšazya-, bərəzant-, mazdaδāta-, *vasō-xšaθra-*, vīspaiti-, vərəθrajan, srīra-, *zantu-paiti-*, *zairi-*, *zairi-gaona-*, *zairi-dōiθra-*, *hukərəp-*, *huxratu-*, huδāta-, *hvarəz-*.
Haoma, Apąm Napāt, Amәša Spәntas, "Arədvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Ahura-Miθra, Tištrya, Fravašis, Miθra, Rašnu, and Haoma:
bərəzant-.
Haoma, Apąm Napāt, and Ahura Mazda:
xšaθrya-.
Haoma and "Arədvī":
aurvant-.
Haoma, "Arədvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Vanant, and Haptō-Iringa:
baēšazya-.
Haoma, "Arədvī," and Miθra:
anāhita-.
Haoma, Arštāt, Aša, Ahura Mazda, Daēnā, and Sraoša:
frādaṭ-gaēθa-.

Haoma, Aša, Aši, Ārmaiti, Ušah, Tištrya, Daēnā, Vāta, and Vohu Manah:
srīra-.
Haoma, Aši, Gəuš Urvan, and Miθra:
dāmiδāta-.
Haoma, Aši, and Miθra:
huδāta-.
Haoma, Ahura Mazda, Fravašis, Vāta, and Sraoša:
vərəθraǰan-.
Haoma and Ātar:
nmānō-paiti-.
Haoma, Ātar, Čistā, Daēnā, Drvāspā, Rātā, Vanant, Vātā, Vərəθraγna, Saokā, Saokənta, Satavaēsa, Savah, and Xᵛarənah:
mazdaδāta-.
Haoma and Fravašis:
tančišta-.
Haoma and Miθra:
daiʜhu-paiti-, vīspaiti-.
Haoma and Vayu:
aurva-.
Haδiš: (4)
ašivant-, *marždikavant-*, vāstravant-, xᵛāθravant-.
Haδiš, Ahura Mazda, Ušah, and Fravašis:
xᵛāθravant-.
Haδiš and Sraoša:
ašivant-.
Haδiš and Hušiti:
vāstravant-.
Haptō-Iringa: (1)
baēšazya-.
Haptō-Iringa, "Arədvī," Aši, Ahura Mazda, Tištrya, Drvāspā, Fravašis, Vanant, and Haoma:
baēšazya-.
Hamaspaθmaēδaya: (1)
arətō-karəθna-.
Hąm-Varəti: (9)
axᵛafnya-, *āsitō-gātu-*, uγra-, ərəδwō-zəngа-, ǰaγāurvah-, *taxmō-tąšyah-*, *nairya-*, framən-nar-, framən-narō-vīra-.
Hąm-Varəti and Ušah:
framən-nar-, framən-narō-vīra-.
Hąm-Varəti, Θwāša, Dāmōiš Upamana, Fravašis, Miθra, Vayu, and Xᵛarənah:
uγra-.
Hąm-Varəti and Miθra:
ərəδwō-zəngа-, ǰaγāurvah-.
Hušiti: (2)
yāirya-, vāstravant-.

Hušiti and Haδiš:
vāstravant-.
Hᵛarə: (3)
aməša-, aurvaṭ-aspa-, *raēva-*.
Hᵛarə and Apąm Napāt:
aurvaṭ-aspa-.
Xᵛarənah: (13)
aš-vandra-, *axᵛarəta-*, uγra-, uparō-kairya-, *gaomavant-*, θamnahvant-, *pouru-išta-*, pouru-xᵛarənah-, *pouru-vąθwa-*, *barajāya-*, mazdaδāta-, yaoxštivant-, varəčahvant-.
Xᵛarənah, Ahura Mazda, Ātar, and Yazatas:
pouru-xᵛarənah-.
Xᵛarənah, Ātar, Čistā, Daēnā, Drvāspā, Rātā, Vanant, Vāta, Vərəθraγna, Saokā, Saokənta, Satavaēsa, Savah, and Haoma:
mazdaδāta-.
Xᵛarənah and Tištrya:
θamnahvant-.
Xᵛarənah, Tištrya, Fravašis, and Vayu:
uparō-kairya-.
Xᵛarənah, Tištrya, and Māh:
varəčahvant-.
Xᵛarənah, Tištrya, Māh, and Miθra:
Xᵛarənah, Θwāša, Dāmōiš Upamana, Fravašis, Miθra, Vayu, and Hąm-Varəti:
yaoxštivant-.
uγra-.

IS CANTICLES AN ADONIS LITANY?

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

IN VARIOUS QUARTERS it is felt that Canticles must be something else than what it seems to be. The attempt is made to vindicate once more its religious character. If it is not an allegory of the love of Yahwe and Israel, or of Christ and the church, it must at least be a litany of some pagan cult. It cannot be allowed to be simply a collection of secular lyrics, singing the love of man and woman. It is not an epithalamium celebrating the marriage of Solomon to the Egyptian princess, or a florilegium used at peasant weddings, where the bridegroom is hailed as king and the bride as queen. Nor is it a drama in which Solomon's love is scorned by a country maiden who remains faithful to her shepherd lover amid the seductions of the royal harem. The book would not have found a place in the canon, it is thought, unless it had originally been written for some religious purpose.

Already in 1906, Wilhelm Erbt[1] suggested that Canticles is a collection of paschal songs of Canaanitish origin. It describes the love of the sun-god Tammuz, called Dod or Shelem, and the moon-goddess Ishtar, figuring under the name of Shalmith. If for some time this view met with little favor, the reason may have been that a reaction was setting in against the astral theories of Winckler and his followers. N. du Jassy's[2] attempt to explain Canticles as a Hebrew translation of certain Osirian litanies made in Alexandria in the Ptolemaic period failed to attract much attention. But a fresh impetus toward the further development of Erbt's theory has recently been given by the publication of a catalogue of love-songs found at Assur in the course of the excavations carried on by the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft.[3] These ballads bid fair to

[1] *Die Hebräer*, 1906, pp. 196-201.

[2] *Le Cantique des Cantiques et le mythe d'Osiris-Hetep*, cited by T. J. Meek, *AJSL* 39. 1 ff.

[3] Erich Eberling, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts*, IV, No. 158; T. J. Meek, 'Babylonian Parallels to Canticles,' *JBL* 43 (1924), pp. 245 ff.

play as important a rôle in the later form of the theory as the famous Syrian Threshing Table in the wedding-song hypothesis. Canticles is regarded as a Passover liturgy expressing the love of Tammuz and Ishtar, the king and queen of heaven, and also of the hierodules, male and female, who represent these divinities. A new feature is the emphasis upon its religious purpose to awaken by this love, through imitative magic, the life of nature, and to bring forth fertility, the blessings of the womb and of the fields.

In a series of articles, Professor Theophile J. Meek[4] has elaborated this view. He calls attention to the evidences of Tammuz cult in Judah, presents in a new translation the Babylonian songs which he regards as connected with this worship, stresses the similarity between these and Canticles, points out what he considers as Babylonian loan-words in the latter, finds in it not only the name of Tammuz, but also that of his wife Shala and references to her home in Syria and descent to the nether world in search of her husband, as well as to numerous objects related to this cult, and concludes that the Song of Songs is a Tammuz liturgy whose religious character is obvious, inasmuch as it sets forth the way in which the love of this god and his sister-spouse, and human imitation of it, may bring fertility to the earth, and accounts for its place in the canon of Jewish scriptures. Mr. Wilfred H. Schoff,[5] in an ingenious essay, gives the support of an expert in one particular field little known to ordinary exegetes. His interest centres on the things mentioned in Canticles which are also found in the descriptions of the temple and the tabernacle, and especially on the ingredients of the anointing oil and the incense. These seem to him to have been derived from the Tammuz cult, and their frequent occurrence in Canticles he regards as an indication that this work is an Adonis liturgy. He thinks that some of the spices, such as spikenard, saffron, aloes, and henna, were introduced in a later revision of the text, as they are not likely to have been known in Israel in pre-exilic times, and on this point his judgment is of great value. Dr. Schoff also emphasizes the political purpose, to

[4] *AJSL* 39. 1-14; *JBL* 43 (1924), pp. 245 ff.; 'The Song of Songs and the Fertility Cult,' in *The Song of Songs, A Symposium*, 1924, pp. 48 ff.

[5] 'The Offering Lists in the Song of Songs and their Political Significance,' in *The Song of Songs, A Symposium*, 1924, pp. 80 ff.

legitimize certain elements of the popular Tammuz cult in the official worship of the state.

It should be admitted at the outset that the assumption of pagan survivals in the festivals of Israel and in its sanctuaries is perfectly legitimate. Not only Purim and Hanukka, but also Mazzoth, Shabuoth, and Sukkoth were clearly of foreign origin. Nomads do not celebrate agrarian festivals. Most of the sanctuaries were taken over from the former inhabitants, and that in Jerusalem was built by a Tyrian architect. In all of them, including the royal temple at Jerusalem, heathen cults were carried on. Songs were, no doubt, sung and stories told that were appropriate to each. Esther was probably composed for the late Purim festival, and Lamentations may be a liturgy for the 10th of Ab, later transferred to the 9th of Ab. It is possible that the reading of Canticles, with its spring air, at Pesaḥ, Ruth, with its harvest atmosphere, at Shabuoth, and Ecclesiastes, with its praise of wine, at Sukkoth, goes back to relatively early times, though we know [6] it only as a medieval custom, and Ecclesiastes certainly cannot have been written as a vintage hymn or Ruth as a pentecostal story. The Pesaḥ ritual may not always have been what we find it in the Pentateuch. Concerning the death and resurrection of a god the Assur texts have added fresh details. Zimmern [7] has published the stage-directions for a sort of miracle-play performed in the temple of Marduk at Babylon every New Year's Day. Marduk is bound, scourged, condemned to death, and led to execution with a malefactor, while another is released. His clothes are placed before the divine queen of Uruk, Ishtar, and a goddess seeks his tomb. Marduk descends to hell (*iriddi kisukkis*), and the spirits in prison rejoice to see him; eventually he rises from the dead. How many such features, of ultimately Babylonian or Amoritish origin, may have been added to the story of the martyrdom of Jesus, as his disciples remembered their master over the paschal table? And may not a great deal have been said and done at the spring festival in ancient Israel that has not been recorded in the purified ritual? It is natural that an effort should be made to find in Canticles the remains of an Adonis litany.

[6] Cp. G. Wildeboer, *Het Onstaan van den Kanon des Ouden Verbonds*, 1891, pp. 11 ff.

[7] *Zum babylonischen Neujahrsfest*, II, 1918.

Nevertheless, the arguments advanced in favor of this view are by no means convincing. According to Ezekiel 8:14 women sat weeping for Tammuz in the northern gate of Yahwe's house in Jerusalem. This shows that Tammuz was worshipped in the temple and that his home was supposed to be in the north. There was mourning for Hadad-Rimmon in the valley of Megiddo (Zech. 12:11). While the lamentation הוי אדון over Jehoiakim and Zedekiah (Jer. 22:18, 34:5) is not necessarily connected with the Adonis cult, Isa. 17:10 f. may allude to Adonis gardens. In view of what we know about this cult it may naturally be assumed that there was also rejoicing over the resurrection of the god; but there is no direct evidence of this. Astarte (עשתרת) was worshipped in Israel from early times; and "the queen of heaven" (מלכת השמים) for whom the women make cakes (Jer. 7:18; cp. 44:17) was undoubtedly Ishtar-Venus. Whether she was thought of in Israel as having descended to the nether world to bring Tammuz back, we do not know. The intercession of the goddess is not a necessary feature of the solar myth.

The catalogue of songs found at Assur gives no more than the first line of any of them. The references to Nana (l. 38) and to 'lamentation,' if that is the meaning of *melilu, šiḫatu,* and *šuaru,* as seems probable, indicate that some of them are religious. In l. 18, Langdon reads *suni ib-bu-ri-ti* and translates: "The bosom of a female friend is a jar of sweetness"; Meek reads: ^{a}*Ni-ip-pu-ri-ti,* 'My Nippurite' and finds a reference to Ishtar. Other songs may be secular. It is difficult to decide. One may question, *e. g.,* whether 'son' (*maru*) always refers to Tammuz, whose name is never mentioned, and 'sons' to male votaries. Even if such terms were used in the cult, they may also have been common enough among the women who plied their trade independently of the sanctuaries. Some texts just published by Eberling [8] give an idea of the language as well as practices of the laity.

Meek thinks that the similarities of these *irtu*-songs to Canticles are sufficiently marked to convince the most skeptical that they are both liturgies of the fertility cult. "The structure," he says, "is the same: two lovers representing god and goddess wooing

[8] 'Liebeszauber im alten Orient,' in *Mitteilungen der altorientalischen Gesellschaft,* I, 1, 1925.

each other and alternating in the praise of each other's charms." But there is no hint in Canticles of either a god or a goddess, and lovers are wont to praise each other's charms. "The general theme is the same (love)" and "the lines breathe the same delight in love." That is true of all love-songs. "Many of the phrases are quite identical." There is a general resemblance in the woman's frank invitation to come and taste love: but the most careful search does not reveal a single phrase that is quite identical. On the other hand, there are numerous references to lamentation in the Babylonian songs, if Meek is right, while there are none in Canticles. It certainly seems fanciful to discover in the woman's allusion to her sun-burnt complexion (1:6) a reference to the drying up of vegetation. "The intent of all is manifestly to bring about the awakening of life in nature." This is so far from being manifest that there is not the slightest hint of such an intent in Canticles. In 6:11 f. the dancer says:

> "To the garden of nuts I went down
> To behold the green plants by the brook,
> To observe if the vine was in bloom,
> If the pomegranate was in flower."

Her amorous promptings may be revealed in the following line: "if the love-apples fragrant were"; but assuredly there is no suggestion of a magic ritual by which the plants will grow. If *iṣṣur aladi* 'bird of child-bearing' is the correct reading in l. 34, there is a possible allusion to the increase of children; and Eberling[9] points out, that, in the myth of the pestilence god, Ira praises the *natati*, or sacred prostitutes of Babylon, because "they cause the womb to live," *i. e.*, do not practise abortion. The 'blessings of the womb' were dear to the Hebrews. But there is not the slightest trace in Canticles of this kind of fertility.

Meek holds the opinion that the many *hapax legomena* in Canticles as well as certain peculiarities of language "bespeak a non-Hebraic origin," and lists a large number of so-called Babylonian loan-words to show that Canticles "in its early form came more or less directly from the Canaanites" whose language he thinks

[9] *L. c.*, p. 5.

was "essentially the same as the Akkadian." Cannon[10] had already noted four: כתל, *kutallu,* 'wall'; טנף, *tanapu,* 'defile'; אמן, *ammanu,* 'skilled workman'; רהיט, *ratu,* 'panel.' Meek adds nineteen: איכה, *ekama,* 'where'; תור, *taru,* 'go around'; עפר, *apparu,* 'gazelle'; חרכים, *'lattice'* from *ḥaraka,* 'cut in'; זמר, *zamaru,* 'ritual song'; רפד, *rapadu,* 'support'; גלש, *galasu,* 'flow'; רחץ, *raḥaṣu,* 'wash'; לבב, *lababu,* 'hearten'; תלתלים, *taltallu,* 'palm branches'; מלאת, *milu,* 'flood'; דגל, *dagalu,* 'look'; עשת, *isitu,* 'column'; שש, *šaššu,* 'marble'; אגן, *aganu,* 'basin'; סנסנים, *sisannu,* 'branches'; ארגמן, *argamannu,* 'purple'; דבב, *dababu,* 'plan'; and רקח, *riḳḳu,* 'spices.' But כתל is no doubt also connected with Ar. *katala,* 'heap up blocks'; טנף is also found in Syr. and Ar.; and אמן in Syr. and Nab. Whether רהיט, apparently 'panel,' is the same as *ratu* is uncertain. איכה = Aram. איכא; תורים, 'circlets,' is connected with Ar. *tāra,* 'move in a circle'; עפר = Ar. *ghafru;* זמר is not limited to a ritual song, as R. Akiba (Tosephta Sanhedrin xii) complains of youth singing Canticles in the winehouses כמין זמר, 'as a kind of secular song'; רפד is more closely related to Ar. *rafada,* 'support' than to Ass. *rapadu,* 'stretch out'; גלש Ar. *galasa,* 'sit' may be the meaning in Cant. 4^1 6^5 (Oxford Dictionary), but Erman[11] suggests Egyptian *kls* = to leap; רחץ is found in Ar. and Eth.; לבב is Ar. *labbaba,* 'to wound in the heart'; תלתלים does not mean 'palm branches' (Gk. ἐλάται) but 'locks' or 'braids' connected with *talla,* 'fall,' 'hang down'; מלאת is not *milu,* 'flood,' but connected with מלא as ממלאים, 5^{14}, shows; דגל = 'sign' gives a good sense in 2^4 and דגיל, 5^{10} may be compared with *insignia* from *signum,* while *dagalu,* 'look,' does not suit either context. עשת may be Ass. *isitu,* but was used by the Hebrews (Talmud) to designate a polished slab, a bar; שש is found also in Syr.; אגן also in Ar. and Aram. (סהר being probably Ar. *saḥru,* 'enchantment'); סנסנים is also found in Syr.; ארגמן, Ass. *argamanu,* as already Haupt indicated (Z. A. II, 267) is of doubtful origin, and it is by no means certain that it appeared in Babylonia before it was used in Syria. דבב is more clearly related to Ar. *dabba,* 'move slowly' than to Ass. *dababu,* 'speak secretly,' 'plan'; and רקח 'incense'

[10] *The Song of Songs,* Cambridge, 1913.

[11] *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung,* 28, 1, Jan. 1925, p. 5.

probably came from Arabia, as Ar. *raḳāḥat,* 'commerce' and *raḳāḥiyyu,* 'merchant' were no doubt derived from the chief article of Arabian commerce.

The significance of these words had been approximately ascertained by the aid of other Semitic tongues. In regard to some of them it has been confirmed by Assyrian usage. There is no evidence that any of them is an Assyrian loan-word. Assyrian words whose meaning is sometimes guessed, in the first instance, from the conjectural values assigned to *hapax legomena* in one or another of the Semitic languages, often prove very helpful. But it is rash to assume in every case a borrowing and an Assyrian origin, and quite impossible to prove it. Words undoubtedly passed from one nation to another, especially if the objects designated by them also migrated. It should be remembered, however, that the vocabulary of any ancient people contained many words not used at all, or only once, in the literary remains that have happened to be preserved. The people known to us as Phoenicians called themselves Canaanites, and their speech was the language of Canaan (לשון כנען). This language the Hebrews adopted and, aside from dialectic differences, our early Hebrew records are likely to give a more adequate idea of the speech of Canaan than either the Phoenician and Carthaginian inscriptions or the hints in cuneiform and hieroglyphic texts, valuable as these are. It was not essentially the same as Akkadian, unless by essence is meant what is common to a group of Semitic languages.

Erbt maintained that Tammuz is referred to in Cant. as Dod and presented as the most convincing evidence 5:9 which he translated: "Wer anders als Dod ist dein Geliebter?" This is accepted by Meek: "Who but Dod is thy beloved?" Even if מה is changed to מי, it would be difficult to justify this reading. The two passages (1 Chron. 29:3; 2 Sam. 13:16) in which Gesenius translated 'ausser,' 'ausgenommen' do not warrant the sense given to the preposition by Erbt and Meek. On the assumption that in one case דוד has its usual meaning and in the other is to be understood as Dod = Tammuz, it might mean: "Who is thy lover more than, over and above, or in comparison with, Dod?" This is obviously impossible. The description naturally follows a question: "What is thy lover more than a lover (any lover)?"

Ishtar is also called Shulmanit; ^{ilat} *Ištar Uru-si-lim-ma* = Shulmanit (VAT 10434); Urusilimma, according to Meek, is a city in Babylonia. Meek assumes that שולמית has been abbreviated from שולמנית, or expanded from *Šala*, the wife of Adad. This change of our text, demanded only by the theory, is no more convincing than the identification of the lover as Tammuz. Shala is a mountain goddess: *belit šadi, Šala ša šadi.* The mountain is supposed to be Lebanon. Hence: "Come with me from Lebanon!" 4^{8}. But there is no indication that the lady of the Lebanon region is a goddess or that she is identical with the dancer in Amminadab's camp, playfully alluded to as the Shulamite, Abishag of Shunem. Ishtar's descent to the nether world was found by Erbt in the woman's search for her lover in the streets of the city. Meek adopts this interpretation. The city is, allegorically, hell; so are the garden in the country, the flowing waters, the hills, and the bosom of the beloved. The tedious search of the goddess is also seen in 8^{1} which, with great freedom, is translated: "O that some one would bring thee back, O brother, to me, thou who didst suck the breasts of my mother, that I might find thee in the street, kiss thee, and people no longer despise me!" Why people should despise the suddenly prudish goddess for kissing her husband in the streets of hell is not clear. At first Meek regarded the panegyric on love, 8^{6} f., the brightest jewel in the collection, as an interpolation, but he was finally persuaded by the mention of death and Sheol and the many waters that will not quench love that it must refer to "the power of the love of the goddess to win the god back from the nether world." A descent of Marduk to hell to bring back Ishtar has not yet been found, and the beautiful Canticle 2^{8-13} will therefore have to be explained as an unsuccessful effort of a male votary to bring fertility to the soil. Almost everything that a couple of lovers would be likely to notice and mention in the spring under the Syrian sky is brought into connection with the Tammuz cult: sun, moon, and stars; mountains, rivers, fountains, fields, and gardens; houses, tents, huts, rafters, pillars, and panels; cedars, cypresses, vines, lilies, apples, olives, and pomegranates; wine, honey, milk, and perfumes; doves, gazelles, foxes, and horses. By the allegorical method it is all turned into veiled allusions to the infernal regions and the practices of sacred prostitution.

Verily, what has been described as 'die Leidensgeschichte des Hohenliedes' still continues.

Erbt and Meek find it natural that an Adonis liturgy should have gained a place in the canon of Jewish scriptures. Stripped of the features supposed to be related to this pagan cult, it would have no sacred character, and could have been cherished only because of its assumed Solomonic authorship. This is not deemed sufficient. It is therefore thought that these features were transferred to the Yahwe cult. How this was done, Schoff seeks to explain. Tammuz and Astarte were worshipped in Jerusalem when the city was taken by David. The Jebusites continued this worship. For political reasons it was favored by Solomon and installed in the royal temple. Its influence is shown in this temple, its structure, vessels, and ceremonies, as is indicated by the description in 1 Kings 4 ff., and that of the tabernacle, Ex. 25. Spices peculiar to the Tammuz cult were used in the composition of the sacred oil and the incense, Ex. 30. The duty of supporting the new sanctuary was of such importance that boys at school in Jerusalem are likely to have been taught to recite the injunction concerning the *Terumah,* the heave-offering, as American boys learn by heart the Declaration of Independence. Each cult had its own ritual which naturally affected the others. Canticles was originally a Tammuz liturgy. It was adapted to the needs of the national sanctuary and was preserved among the treasures of the temple archives. A strong party, including many Judaeans, was devoted to these divinities. It had to be considered and, in view of prophetic opposition, conciliated. At the spring festival the kings and queens of Judah represented Adonis and Astarte. When the foreign domination came, a king and queen were probably elected to take charge of this function. Gradually, Yahwe was substituted for Tammuz and the Daughter of Jerusalem for Astarte. As דוד also meant 'lover,' its earlier use to designate Adad-Tammuz was disguised. But the ritual remained essentially the same. A second revision took place. It is chiefly signalized by the appearance in the text of new spices not known in pre-exilic times, just as such additions were made in the Talmudic description of the oil and the incense. The book was kept with the other canonical scriptures in the temple archive, and it may be assumed that "the rolls of the temple were there

because they referred in some way to the services and ceremonies of the temple."

There is much evidence that Shemesh, Tammuz, Astarte and other divinities were worshipped in the royal temple at Jerusalem before the Exile. Each cult obviously had some peculiar ceremony, and there was no doubt borrowing and adaptation as well as rivalry between them. Oil and incense were probably used in all of them. The Yahwe cult seems to have insisted upon a certain proportion of the ingredients. Hence the prohibition against their being prepared in the same manner for secular purposes. Spices were of course imported and employed, not only for religious use, but also as a luxury. They were in the homes of the rich. The thoughtless wife of Prov. 7, who seems to have belonged to the bourgeoisie, perfumed her couch with myrrh, aloes, and cinnamon; and lovers innocent of the Tammuz cult rejoiced in wine, nuts, and pomegranates. There is not the slightest indication that the kings and queens of Judah, or of Israel, represented Tammuz and Astarte at the Pesaḥ feast, and no trace of a protest against such a custom in the Deuteronomic law or the prophets. It is scarcely conceivable that when the High Priest became the head of the state, kings and queens were elected *pro tempore* to impersonate divinities whose worship was no longer tolerated in the presence of Yahwe. Any custom, symbol, or offering characteristic of the proscribed cults would naturally be removed. If milk and honey had been offered and Tammuz litanies sung, Nehemiah and Ezra would no doubt have objected. The comparison of a kiss with sweet milk and honey cannot prove that such customs were allowed to continue or that Canticles was used either as a Tammuz liturgy or in the cult at all. The occurrence of spikenard, saffron, aloes, and henna may be only an indication, along with many others, of its late origin. Neither the enallage of genders, nor the relative pronoun שֶׁ, nor the absence in Daniel and Ezra of words found in other Aramaic dialects, can rightly be cited as signs of older usage. Every instance of שֶׁ in early Hebrew documents is suspect on text-critical grounds. For centuries אשר alone was used. As late as the second century B. C. שֶׁ is struggling for recognition. In Ecclesiasticus there are 45 cases of אשר to 6 of שֶׁ, and in the Zadokite document 118

cases of אשר to 1 of שׁ, 20[4]. In Cant. שׁ is uniformly used, אשר only in the title. Schoff admits that אפריון = *φορεῖον* and that *pardes* is Persian. There is no reason for believing that the canonical books were kept in a temple archive, or that the rolls used in the synagogues were limited to such as had to do with the services and ceremonies of the temple. Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, and Job certainly did not. The fact that Solomon was supposed to be the author, for reasons no more convincing than in the case of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Sapientia, Psalter, or Odes, was probably decisive. A work of the wisest of kings could not be discarded, and was likely to have a hidden meaning. The allegorical interpretation silenced all scruples.

But although the theory we have been considering does not commend itself, it is altogether probable that the poet whose *diwan* of secular love songs has so fortunately been preserved to us derived some of his conceits and imagery from popular festivities. In my translation and commentary,[12] I suggested that the dance of the Xylophoria furnished such an occasion for the first canticle. Elsewhere he may have contributed his share to the merry ballads of marriage feasts. It is not impossible that he also drew upon ideas and expressions that had grown up in connection with the customs at the agrarian festivals and in the once popular cults. The analogy of erotic poetry does not favor the assumption that he confined himself to wedded love, and many passages become quite incomprehensible on this view. Experience and observation, a passion for beauty in nature, rare in the ancient world, a joy in the life of the senses as spontaneous as the warbling of a bird in the mating season, and an admirable mastery of form moulded these precious lyrics.

[12] *The Messages of the Poets*, 1911, p. 241.

THE INDIAN ORIGIN OF THE BUDDHA IMAGE

ANANDA COOMARASWAMY
MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS, BOSTON

IN PREPARING A WORK on the history of Indian art,[1] to be published probably at the end of the current year, I have found it necessary to abandon the commonly accepted theory of the Greek origin of the Buddha image. The argument will be set forth in greater detail in that work. In the meantime I have thought that it would be interesting to gather together a number of quotations, mostly, though not invariably, from well known scholars already committed to the theory of Greek origin. These extracts are admittedly selected *ad hoc,* and do not always fairly represent the author's real views; they are rather, at least in some cases, to be regarded as incidental admissions. My object in gathering them together here is to show that there actually exists a great deal of evidence in favour of an Indian origin of the Buddha image, and that a theory of an Indian origin must not be lightly regarded as a rank heresy proceeding "par engouement d'esthetician ou rancune de nationaliste," as M. Foucher has rather awkwardly suggested, but must be seriously considered in the light of all the evidence now available.

The view to which I now adhere is that *the Buddha image is of Indian origin;* that is, that the Gandhāra and Mathurā types were created locally about the same time, in response to a necessity created by the internal development of the Buddhism common to both areas[2]; that in each area the sculptors, following similar literary and oral traditions in respect of iconography, created a type plastically in accordance with stylistic traditions of their own,[3] and that the Mathurā type is the main source of the

[1] *Kunst und Kunstgewerbe Indiens und Indonesiens,* to be published in English and German editions by Hiersemann, Leipzig.

[2] I leave aside for the present the question to what extent even the Gandhāran type embodies older Indian formulae, with the remark that "adaptation" would probably be a more accurate term than "creation."

[3] The general use of Kharoṣṭhī script in Gandhāra and of Brāhmī in Mathurā offers an exact parallel: the words are the same, the letters are different and neither script is derived from the other.

Gupta and later development both in and beyond India. In the following section, wishing to be as brief as possible, I have added only so many words of my own as are needed to exhibit the continuity and trend of the argument.

1. *Date of the Greco-Buddhist school of Gandhāra*

Marshall, J. H., *Guide to Taxila,* 1918:

> " Not one of the thousands of known images bears a date in any known era, nor do considerations of style permit us to determine their chronological sequence with any approach to accuracy " (p. 31).

Wilson, H., *Ariana Antiqua,* 1841:

> The stūpas of Afghānistān " are undoubtedly all subsequent to the Christian era " (p. 322).

Goloubew, V., in *B. É. F. E. O.,* 1923:

> " Rien n'empêche en effet, dans l'état présent de nos connaissances de supposer que le buddha indo-grec du Gandhāra soit une creation posterieur de quelques années au buddha indien de Mathurā " (p. 450).

Vogel, J. Ph., *Inscribed Gandhāra sculptures, A. S. I., A. R.,* 1903-04:

> " It is a point on which most authorities agree, that the palmy days of Buddhism and Buddhist art in Gandhāra coincide with the reign of the great Kuṣaṇa kings, and more especially with that of Kaniṣka. This is somewhat more than a hypothesis " (p. 258).

2. *Date of the Mathurā type*

D. B. Spooner, in *A. S. I., A. R.,* 1912-13, pt. 1, p. 26 mentions the discovery at the Kumrahar site, Patna, of " at least one large and inferentially elaborate Bodhisattva statue from Mathurā, which is to be assigned probably to about the dawn of the Christian era or a little later," but gives no illustration or evidence for this early dating.

The Bodhisattva dedicated by Friar Bala at Sārnāth is dated in the third year of Kaniṣka, probably ca. 123 A.D. On palaeographic grounds the Kaṭrā Bodhisattva and Anyor Bodhisattva at Mathurā are dated about the same time. Various other images found at

Śrāvasti, Kasiā, Sārnāth, etc. are in the same style. The Buddha image of Mathurā must have attained some reputation before an outside demand could have arisen (see next section). If we allow only twenty-five years (probably much too little) for this development we must assume a manufacture of Buddha images at Mathurā at least as early as the end of the first century A. D.

Jaina images of the same type occurring in relief on *āyāgapaṭas* etc. may well be considerably earlier, but these, in common with many Buddhas or Bodhisattvas are undated.

In any case we cannot safely take it for granted that any Kuṣāna Buddha or Bodhisattva that we possess was the first one of its kind ever made in stone or any other material.

3. *Independence of the Mathurā type*

Vogel, J. Ph., *The Mathurā school of sculpture, A. S. I., A. R.*, 1906-07:

> "It would indeed be difficult to derive these clumsy and unwieldy figures from the graceful Bodhisattvas of Gandhāra" (p. 150) . . . "enormous difference in style" (p. 151).

Vogel, J. Ph., *The Mathurā school of sculpture, A. S. I., A. R.*, 1909-10:

> "It must be admitted that the Bodhisattva (or Buddha) type represented by these images of the Kushaṇa period cannot be immediately derived from any known class of images in Gandhāra" (p. 86).
>
> "The Mathurā school has different types of Buddha figures, the exact history and meaning of which it is difficult to explain" (p. 78).

Spooner, D. B., *Excavations at Takht-i-Bāhi, A. S. I., A. R.*, 1907-08:

> "Indra and Brahmā were the original figures out of which the sculptural representations of Avalokita and Maitreya were respectively evolved by steps which we cannot trace at present . . . this evolution was an accomplished fact prior to any form of the Gandhāra school with which we are as yet familiar" (p. 144).

Smith, V. A., in *J. A. S. B.*, LVIII, 1889, pt. I, pp. 140, 156:

"the Mathurā sculptures have very little in common with those of Gandhāra and seem to be the work of a different school."

With the single exception of A 47 in the Mathurā Museum (Vogel, J. Ph., in *A. S. I., A. R.*, 1906-07, p. 15), no known image of a Buddha or Bodhisattva in the round has been described by any author as a 'copy' of any Gandhāran type. Only one Gandhāran sculpture (F 42 in the Mathurā Museum, Burgess, *Ancient Monuments*, pls. 56, 57) has been found at Mathurā, and that is not a Buddha.

4. *Mathurā the centre of type-distribution in India*

Mathurā sculptures in the well-known red sandstone of Sikri, and of Kuṣāna and Gupta date, have been found at Sārnāth, Gayā, Allahābād, Kasiā, Śrāvastī, Pāṭaliputra, Rājagṛha, Sāñcī, Taxila, and doubtless at other sites.

Przyluski, J., *Aśokāvadāna*, 1923, p. 9:

A study of the literary sources shows "que l'église de Mathurā eût parmi les communautés bouddhiques une situation privilégiée et qu'elle eût contribué pour une large part au rayonnement de la foi."

Vogel, J. Ph., *The Mathurā school of sculpture, A. S. I., A. R.*, 1909-10:

"The great influence exercised by the Mathurā school on Buddhist art in other religious centres" (p. 78).

Vogel, J. Ph., *Catalogue of the Archaeological Museum at Mathurā*, 1910:

"There is plenty of evidence that the Mathurā school greatly influenced Buddhist art throughout the period of its existence" (p. 28).

"We find Mathurā . . . sending down images to the sacred sites of the Gangetic plains, thus setting examples to the sculptors of Benares and Gayā" (p. 34).

Sahni, D. R., *Catalogue of the Museum of Archaeology at Sārnāth*, 1914:

"I conclude that this image was prepared by a sculptor of Benares in imitation of the Mathurā image above referred to" (p. 37).

Cunningham, A., *A. S. I. Reports,* vol. XI:

" Everywhere in the North-West I find that the old Buddhist statues are made of the Sikri sandstone, from which it would appear that Mathurā must have been the great manufactory for the supply of Buddhist images in Northern India" (p. 75).

The Gandhāran type did not profoundly affect Indian art

5. *The Gandhāran type did not profoundly affect Indian art*

Kern, H., *Manual of Indian Buddhism,* 1896:

" The Buddha type in the Gandhāra sculptures is more Greek than Indian and has therefore not been able to gain the upper hand " (p. 94).

Smith, V. A., *History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon,* 1911:

" Within the limits of India the art of Gandhara was not widely propagated. . . . Political conditions seem to have been responsible to a great extent for the failure of the art to penetrate deeply into the interior " (p. 129).

Referring to the well known seated Buddha of Gupta date at Sārnāth, B (b) 181 in the Sārnāth Museum: " the style, which is singularly original and absolutely independent of the Gandhāra school " (p. 170).

" Whatever influence Greece had exercised on Indian art was practically exhausted by A. D. 400 " (p. 390).

Marshall, Sir J. H., in *Cambridge History of India,* vol. I:

" Hellenistic art never took a real and lasting hold upon India for the reason that the temperaments of the two peoples were radically dissimilar " (p. 649).

Goloubew, V., in *B. É. F. E. O.,* 1923:

" le buddha de Mathurā, ce prototype d'inspiration et de facture indiennes et peutêtre même l'authentique ancêtre de toutes les images du Bienheureux, ne s'est pas éclipsé au contact de l'art gandhārien et qu'il a survécu à la vogue classique sans avoir subi d'altération essentielle " (p. 451).

Cohn, W., *Buddha in der Kunst der Ostens:*

" Buddha-Darstellungen erhalten, in denen weder Hellenistischen noch Gandhara-mässiges anklingt. . . . Einer stilkritischen und psychologisch tiefergehenden Ausdeutung der

Denkmäler . . . kann die These von der Erfindung des Buddha-Bildes im hellenistischen-indischen Gandhara nicht standhalten" (pp. xxvi, xxvii).

Hackin, J., *Guide Catalogue du Musée Guimet, Collections bouddhiques,* p. 23:

"nous verrons disparaître, ensevelis dans les sables du Turkestan, les dernières vestiges de l'art gréco-indien; pour l'Inde, elle reviendra délibérément aux enseignements de ses écoles nationales."

Much more could be said on the subject. I have not, for instance, referred to the seated Buddha types supposed to be represented on coins of Maues (see Dames in *J. R. A. S.,* 1914, p. 793) and Kadaphes (see Whitehead in *Catalogue of the coins in the Panjab Museum, Lahore,* pp. 181, 182). But taking into account only the extracts quoted above it is obvious that there exists good evidence for a Mathurā origin of *the* Buddha image. If Gandhāra "created" at all, it created only a provincial type, of which the influence can scarcely be traced in India after the third or fourth century.

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF IBN KHALDUN

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

A CRITICAL EDITION of Ibn Khaldun is still a *desideratum*. Neither *al Muḳaddama* nor *al 'Ibar* nor *al Riḥla* lies before us in an altogether reliable text. In the case of even those parts that have been edited with most care only a few MSS could be used. In no instance has there been an extensive collation. It is possible that some treatises are extant that have not yet been published. There are *lacunae* in some otherwise good copies. Some have important additions by the author himself that should be incorporated in the text. In Brit. Mus. Add. 33, 271—33, 272, the addition is made in his own hand. The same seems to be true of the supplement to *al Riḥla* in the separate Cairene MS of this work. Two lines, including his signature, were written by himself in the recently discovered Fez MS. To a limited extent we, therefore, have today autographs. But, aside from such marginal notes and additions, these MSS are not autographs, but copies from the original, though made in Ibn Khaldun's life-time, probably under his supervision, and by reputable copyists. In view of the great length of his works it is quite possible that there are omissions and scribal errors. Even the oldest and best copies must be compared throughout with other MSS. There are many variants that have a right to be considered. Even the Turkish versions of Perizadeh and Jevdet Pasha, although particularly the former, as is well known, contains much material that does not come from Ibn Khaldun, have occasionally yielded noteworthy readings. Hard labor is in store for a competent editor. This implies no criticism of the excellent work done by a long line of eminent scholars. Silvestre de Sacy, A. von Hammer-Purgstall, H. A. Hamaker, Eugène Coquebert de Montbret, and G. W. Freytag rendered great services by printing some fragments, chiefly of *al Muḳaddama,* from a single MS or two, or from Hajji Khalifa. The longer sections from *al 'Ibar,* published by Noël de Vergers, C. F. Tornberg, Michele Amari, W. Tiesenhausen, R. Dozy, William Cassels Kay, and Goudefroy Demombynes were based on a careful comparison of some of the best MSS accessible to them. Students

are greatly indebted especially to William McGuckin de Slane and Etienne Quatremère for their editions of Tomes VI and VII (The History of the Berbers) and Tome I (The Prolegomena), although the text they present rests only upon a limited number of MSS. The *Bulaḳ* editions are indispensable, as they alone give the whole *tarikh*. For the first of them, in one folio, that of 1857 (1274 A. H.), the learned Naṣr al Hurini apparently used a copy of the MS sent to Abd al Aziz II, the Merinid ruler of Fez, from Egypt in 1396 (798 A. H.), containing a number of marginal notes. Other local MSS seem to have been used for the editions in seven tomes of 1867 (1284 A. H.) and 1872 (1289 A. H.). It is doubtful whether the Beirut editions of *al Muḳaddama* repose on any other authority. Some of the difficulties of the modern editor have been hinted at by Duncan Black McDonald in his '*Collation from the Prolegomena of Ibn Khaldun.*' Only with a more adequate critical apparatus than has hitherto been available can an edition of the Arabic text be construed that shall in all respects meet scientific demands; and only from such a text should that complete translation into some western language be made which is so urgently demanded in view of the growing importance attached by students of history, philosophy, sociology, economics, and pedagogy to the ideas of the greatest of Arab historians.

What is needed, in the first place, is a survey of all extant MSS. Brockelmann lists some of them; and Seybold adds others. But there are many omissions, and fresh material has been discovered. The notices of these scholars should be supplemented. Such an attempt is here made. There can, of course, be no claim to completeness. It has not always been possible to verify the existence or trace the location of MSS referred to by earlier writers. No doubt many MSS of Ibn Khaldun exist in various Muslim countries where no search has yet been made for them, in mosques, public libraries, and private collections. With more facilities than in former times, the zeal of a Schulz or a Gråberg would assuredly today be more amply rewarded. It would be well if men in the diplomatic service, missionaries, physicians, resident scholars, and travelers were willing to make inquiries and to communicate the results of their investigations.

In the following list the places where MSS of Ibn Khaldun are known to exist have been arranged in alphabetical order. A brief

list has been subjoined of localities where it has been maintained by scholars, at one time or another, that MSS existed, though it is at present impossible to trace their whereabouts. In all such instances the source is indicated whence the information has been received.

Berlin — *Al Muḳaddama* 9363-9364. Cp. W. Ahlwardt, *Verzeichnis der arabischen Handschriften in der K. Hofbibliothek zu Berlin,* 1887 ff.

Cairo — *Tarikh,* National Library 65; 184. MSS in al Azhar. *Al riḥla,* a facsimile loaned by Zachi Pasha to Professor Casanova in Paris. It contains additions to the autobiography made by Ibn Khaldun in 1405 (807 A. H.), partly confirming, partly correcting, the account of Ahmed Ibn Arabshah and others as to Ibn Khaldun's relations to Timur. Cp. T. Hussain, *La philosophie sociale d'Ibn Khaldoun,* 1918.

Constantinople — Nuri Osmaniye 3065-70; Yeni Jami 888 (not 588, as Brockelmann states); Raghib 978; Ibrahim Pasha 863-9. Cp. Seybold, *Verzeichnis der arabischen Hss. d. K. Universitätsbibliothek zu Tübingen,* 1907.

Fez — *Kitab al 'Ibar,* Jami al Ḳarawiyin 1266. Jacob Gråberg of Hemsö, Gotland, heard of this MS in Tangier late in 1821, and sent a learned sharif to secure a transcript, but never received it, as he was removed to Tripoli in January 1822. Cp. *Notizia intorno alla famosa opera istorica di Ibn Khaldun,* 1834. In the beginning of his Muḳaddama, of which Gråberg saw a copy in Tangier, Ibn Khaldun declares that he had sent a copy of al 'Ibar to the mosque of al Ḳarawiyin at Fez (Bulaḳ ed. 1867, I, p. 7). This phrase does not occur either in Quatremère's edition or de Slane's translation. But de Slane knew the passage from the Cairene MS. Cp. Introduction pp. cvii-cix. Alfred Bel revealed the existence of this MS. Cp. his *Catalogue des livres arabes de la bibliothèque de la mosque d'El Qarouiyin à Fès,* 1918, p. 6. In *JA* Juillet-Sept. 1923, E. Lévi-Provençal gives an account of two MSS, of which

only tomes V and III remain, and prints the deed of gift and a facsimile of the page in which Ibn Khaldun's signature occurs. At the end of Vol. V the name of the copyist, Abdallah b. Hasan walad al Faḥuri, occurs, who furnished it in Ramadan 798 (June-July, 1396).

Leiden *Part of Al 'Ibar,* 1350. Cp. M. J. de Goeje and M. Th. Houtsma, *Catalogus Codicum arabicorum Bibl. acad. Lugduno-Batavae* I, 1888. Seybold l. c. mentions also 767, which may be the transcript obtained in Tripoli by Gråberg. *Al Muḳaddama* 176, in possession of J. Brill. Cp. M. T. Houtsma, *Catalogue d'une collection de manuscripts arabes et livres appartenants à la maison J. Brill,* 1889.

Leningrad *Al Muḳaddama* 505, 505a, 505b. Cp. Victor Rosen, *Notices sommaires des manuscrits arabes de la Musée Asiatique à St. Petersbourg,* 1881, p. 115 ff.

London British Museum. *Al 'Ibar* 1237-1238; 9575; add. 23, 271; 23, 272. *Al muḳaddama,* Suppl. 477. Brockelmann gives 934, 279. On the important Add. 23, 271-23, 272 cp. William Wright, in the *Palaeographical Society. Facsimiles of MSS and inscriptions (Oriental Series),* 1875-93. It seems to have been transcribed for the author in Egypt. The genealogical titles were inserted in both volumes by the author himself; and he has also added many marginal notes, containing a history down to about the year 803 (1400-1401 A. D.). Plate LXXXIV exhibits his own hand. On Suppl. 477, which at the end has the author's colophon with the date of composition 1378 (779 A. H.) cp. Charles Rieu, *Supplement to the Catalogue of the Arabic MSS in the British Mus.* 1894, p. 208. Cp. also *Catalogus codicum MSS orientalium qui in Museo Britannico asservantur.* Pars. II *Codices arabicos complectens,* 1846-71.

Madrid Bibliotheca nacional. *Al 'Ibar* 117, 550. Cp. F. Gaillen F. Robles, *Catalogo de los manuscritos arabes*

existente en la bibl. nacional, Madrid 1889. Bibliotheca Escorial. Reinaud in *Bibliographie Universelle* maintains that there is an autograph copy of a treatise on the Muslim religion by Ibn Khaldun in this library; and the author of the article on Ibn Khaldun in the *Enciclopedia italiana* assigns to the same place a treatise on logic written for the son of Muhammad V, the Nasrid ruler of Granada. Neither is mentioned by Hartwig Derenbourg in his *Les Manuscrits de l'Escuriale* I, 1884; II 1893. But this catalogue does not include the religious works, ending with No. 788.

Munich *Al 'Ibar,* 373. Cp. W. Aumer, *Die arabischen Handschriften des K. Hof-und Staatsbibliothek zu München,* 1866. There are also excerpts from Ibn Khaldun in 654: Auszüge aus den *Resail Ikhwan al Ṣafa.*

Oxford Bodleyan. *Al 'Ibar* 330-331. Cp. Uri Nicoll, *Bibliothecae Bodleyanae codicum orientalium* MSS *Catalogus,* 1787-1835. Also quoted as 124, 125.

Paris Bibliothèque nationale. *Muḳaddama, 'Ibar, Riḥla.* 1577-1535. Supplément 742 ff. 1536 = 745 is supposed to be spurious. Cp. W. McGuckin de Slane, *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes de la bibliothèque nationale,* 1883.

Tübingen 3-5. *'Ibar.* Cp. Christian Friedrich Seybold, *Verzeichnis der arabischen Handschriften d. K. Universitätsbibliothek zu Tübingen,* 1907. Vol. II and parts of VI and VII of Bulak ed.

Tunis *Tarikh* 3507 et al. Cp. Seybold, l. c.

Vienna *Muḳaddama* 815-816. Cp. Gustav Flügel, *Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Hss. d. K. K. Hofbibliothek zu Wien,* 1865-67.

Wigan Bibliotheca Lindesiana, at Haigh Hall. 491-497. *Muḳaddama, 'Ibar* and *Riḥla* 7 vols. Cp. Jas. L. Lindsay, *A Handlist of Oriental MSS, Ar.-Pers.-Turkish, Edinburgh,* 1898.

The following MSS are still unverified:

Algiers MS in the Hanifite mosque, used by de Slane for the *Riḥla, Notices et Extraits,* 1849 p. III.

Beirut Whether any local MS was used for the editions of *al Muḳaddama,* 1879, 1886, 1900, and 1904 is uncertain. This has been assumed particularly in the case of that of 1900 which is supplied with vowel signs. Cp. McDonald, l. c.

Cambridge A Cambridge MS is referred to by Gråberg, l. c.; and de Sacy mentions that a translation of the Cambridge MS by Dr. Samuel Lee was announced in 1837. But neither E. H. Palmer, *Descriptive Catalogue of the MSS in the Cambridge Library,* 1870, nor Edward G. Browne, *A Handlist of the Muhammedan MSS in the Cambridge Library,* 1900, nor his *A Supplementary Handlist of the Muhammedan MSS in the Libraries of the University and Colleges of Cambridge,* 1922, knows of any such MS. It is possible that the MS belonged to Dr. Lee.

Shella near Sale An incomplete MS of *al 'Ibar* was said to exist at this sanctuary by the informant of Gråberg. Cp. *Notizia,* 1834.

Tangier *Al Muḳaddama.* A MS was found by Gråberg in the principal mosque of which he secured a transcript. Cp. *Notizia,* 1834.

BRIEF NOTES

Dravidian notes

From the position of the Dardic languages at the extreme north of India, we might well expect to find foren elements in them. It has been noticed that a few Dardic nouns are connected with equivalents used in Burushaski, a puzzling unclassified language spoken in the mountains north of the Dardic region.[1] More remarkable is the fact that a Burushaski verb is represented in Pashai, the westernmost variety of Dardic. Most of the Dardic languages have for the verb 'die' words from the *mr*-basis; one has *nāš-*, connected with Sanskrit *naç-* (perish); and Pashai has *lē-*, which Grierson leaves unexplained.[2] Burushaski *īr-* (die), which seems to have a variant form *ir-*,[3] shows us the foren basis of *lē*.

I am not aware that the Dravidian element of Dardic has been noticed. In Gârwi, a central variety of Dardic, we find *ṭhōs* (head). Initial *tr*, widely kept in Dardic or changed to *tš* thru unvoicing of the *r*, has become *ṭh* in Gârwi *ṭhā* (three). We may therefore assume that *thōs* came from **tlōs* or **tlaus*, with *l* (like *r* in the same position) reduced to the weakest audible sound that could be uttered after *t*. This **tlōs* or **tlaus* represents the Dravidian word for 'head': Kui *tlau*, Gôndi *talā*, Telugu *tala*, Tulu *tare*, Kanara *tale*, Tamil *talai*. The southern Dravidian forms seem to have the basis **talas*, with *s* changed to *i* or lost.[4] But Kui *tlau* indicates **talos* as an older form. And with displacement of *l*, as in the Kui word, **talos* becomes nearly the same as the basis inferred from Dardic *thōs*.

Dravidian *zn*, which made Brâhui *d* (< *zd*), Gôndi *h* (< *s*), Kui *s*, Kurukh-Malto *t* (<*st*) and southern *n*, is represented in Malto *toro*<**znoro* (mouth) and the equivalent Telugu *nōru*.[5] Grierson leaves the origin of Pashai *dōr* (mouth) unexplained.[6] Evidently *dōr* is connected with northern Dravidian **zdoro*< **znoro*.

---

[1] *Linguistic Survey of India*, vol. 8, pt. 2, p. 6.
[2] Grierson, *Piśāca Languages*, p. 68 (London, 1906).
[3] *L. S. I.*, vol. 8, pt. 2, p. 554.
[4] *A. J. Ph.*, vol. 40, p. 83.
[5] *A. J. Ph.*, vol. 44, p. 71.
[6] Grierson. *Piśāca Languages*, p. 76.

In central and western Dardic the word 'nose' appears as *natkēl, nōzōr,* and in other forms with suffixal *r.*[7] Malto *muso* seems to show the basic form of Dravidian 'nose'; southern *mūkku* and *mūgu* have *kk*<*gg*<*gw* and *g*<*gw,* derived from the hiatus-filling *w* which was added after the *s* was lost. Gôndi *mussōr* (nose) is a compound, with an ending derived from the word **znoro.*[8] Kui *muŋgēli* (nose) could have come from **mug* . . . <**mugw* . . . <**muw* . . . <*mus* . . . , as Kui has lost ancient medial *s.* Its ending seems to lack parallels in ordinary Dravidian; but it resembles that of *nakhēlī* (nose) in Kanjari, an Aryan tongue supposed to have a Dravidian basis.[9] The endings of Dardic *natkēl, nōzōr* and other *r*-forms may be derived from Dravidian equivalents

The basis of Brâhui *xan* (eye) seems to be represented by Tamil *kaṇ.* If an older form of the basis began with γ or *gh,* it would explain the initial γ as well as the added nasal in Dardic words for 'eye': Khôwar *γetš* (a variant of *etš*) and Pashai *antš.* Nasalized vowels, corresponding to the *an* of the Pashai word, are found in many Indic equivalents of Sanskrit *akṣi:* they likewise could have come from blending with the Dravidian word.

The form of Gârwi *thair* (hand) is queer.[10] Apparently the *r* came from *khur* (foot); and the *h* may have come from *khur.* The remaining **tai* seems to be a blend of Eranian *dast* and Dravidian *kai* (hand), with *t* combining the dentality of Aryan and the voicelessness of Dravidian.

Bashgali, a western variety of Dardic, has *dui* as a variant of *dušt* (hand). This *dui* is apparently the source of Brâhui *dū* (hand), the *i* being assimilated in accord with Brâhui *bā* for **bai* (mouth), beside Kurukh *bai,* Kanara *bāji,* Tamil *vāji.*

Wakhi, an Eranian tongue spoken north of the Dardic region, has *mis* (nose), with unexplained *m.*[11] We may assume that *mis* came from the Dravidian root found in Brâhui *bāmus* (nose < *mouth-nose), Gôndi *mussōr* (nose < *nose-mouth) and Malto *muso.*

Washington, D. C. EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

[7] *L. S. I.,* vol. 8, pt. 2, p. 532; Grierson, *Piśāca Languages,* p. 76.
[8] *A. J. Ph.,* vol. 44, p. 71.
[9] *L. S. I.,* vol. 11, p. 100.
[10] Grierson, *Piśāca Languages,* p. 73.
[11] Grierson, *Ishkashmi, Zebaki, and Yazghulami,* p. 90 (London, 1920). Wakhi often palatalizes velar vowels, as in *γiš* = Persian *gōš* (ear).

Notes on Cappadocian Tablets

The Cappadocian sign 

FOR THE FIRST TIME it is possible to state positively that the above sign has the value 1/4. In *PSBA*, Nov. 1883, p. 18 f., Professor A. H. Sayce published a transliteration and translation of a Cappadocian tablet, in line 3 of which he translates, "six and one quarter (?) shekels." From his transliteration, not having seen the original, I judge that the sign he read conjecturally 1/4 (*pir*) is the same sign discussed here. If this is the case, apparently without any proof at his disposal, Sayce has correctly guessed the value of the sign. The signs  and  are listed by Contenau in *Trente Tablettes Cappadociennes*. He tentatively assigns the value 1/6 to both signs (p. 77). Proof that the former equals 1/4 is found in two tablets in the James B. Nies Collection of Cappadocian tablets at Yale. Reading the value 1/4 where this sign occurs in NBC 3778: 3-6, we have: *25 TUG^{zun} I-din-a-bu-um ub-lam 7-1/4 šiqlu ta kasab(áb)-šú-nu 3 ma-na 1-1/4 šiqlu,* "25 garments Idin-abum brought to me; at 7-1/4 shekels each, the silver for them is 3 minas, 1-1/4 shekels." The mathematical calculation involved here is 25 x 7-1/4 shekels = 181-1/4 shekels or 3 minas, 1-1/4 shekels. The only value for the sign in question which will balance this equation is 1/4. The first ten lines of NBC 1653 read as follows:

11 LU šá Ḫa-bu-a-lá ir-dī-a-ni	11 sheep which Ḫabuala brought to me:
lib-bu 4 LU a-na 17 šiqlu kasbim	Therefrom, 4 sheep for 17 shekels of silver
ta-ad-nu 2 LU a-na 9-1/4 šiqlu	you sold; 2 sheep for 9-1/4 shekels
ta-ad-nu 1 LU a-na	you sold; 1 sheep for
4-1/6 šiqlu ta-dī-in	4-1/6 shekels you sold;
1 LU 3-2/3 šiqlu 15 še a-dī-in	1 sheep for 3-2/3 shekels, 15 *še* I sold;
1 LU a-na 5 šiqlu a-dī-in	1 sheep for 5 shekels I sold;
2 LU i-na bît ḫar-ri-ni	2 sheep in our *bît ḫarri*
ta-ab-ḫu napḫar kasbim	you shut up. Total of the silver
1/2 ma-na 9-1/6 šiqlu kasbim	1/2 mina, 9-1/6 shekels of silver.

It is evident that the total in line 10 is obtained by adding together the prices for the various sheep. For convenience let all the items be reduced to shekels. The total, 1/2 mina, 9-1/6 shekels =

39-1/6 shekels. On the basis of 180 *še* = 1 shekel, a well known fact, 3-2/3 shekels, 15 *še* = 3-3/4 shekels. The following equation may therefore be formed: 17 + 9-1/4 + 4-1/6 + 3-3/4 + 5 = 39-1/6. It will be seen that in this equation any fraction whatever might be substituted for the sign read 1/6, but no other value is possible for the sign read 1/4, no matter what fraction is substituted for 1/6. Since there are 4 wedges in the sign 1/4 and 6 in the other it is very probable that the latter is really 1/6. These two sign values are of interest because, so far as is known, they were never used in Babylonia or Assyria. The question is therefore raised whether the Cappadocians invented them or adopted them from some other source.

The causative stem of the verb

The *šaf'el* form of all verbs with a weak first radical (except ʾ) in Cappadocian becomes a *sif'el:* from *abālu, ú-si-be-lu* NBC 1711:6. But when the first radical is strong, the regular *šaf'el* is used: from *šaqālu, ú-šá-aš-ga-al-šú-ma* BIN IV, 6:11. That the use of *šaf'el* or *sif'el* was determined by phonetic principles and that it was not merely the arbitrary peculiarity of certain verbs is shown by the fact that when a verb which would otherwise have a *s,* is used with the נ formation, the *š* returns: from *abālu, uš-tî-bi-el* BIN IV, 6:6. Many other examples of these points have been collected which I hope to publish soon in a fuller treatment of the subject. A comparison of this Cappadocian causative stem with that of Old Akkadian, on the basis of Ungnad's *Materialien zur Altakkadischen Sprache, MVAG,* 20 (2), shows that with regard to the use of *s* instead of *š,* Cappadocian stands between the usage of Akkad and that of the Third Ur Dynasty. In the texts of Akkad *s* is used with verbs whose first radical is either weak or strong; in Cappadocian the *s* is restricted to verbs פ״י weak (except ʾ); in the Ur Dynasty it is not used at all. These facts suggest a closer relationship of Cappadocian to the language of the Kingdom of Akkad than to that of the Third Ur Dynasty.

The god Ea and Yah

It was long ago suggested by Professor Hommel that possibly the Babylonian Ea is to be identified with the West Semitic Yah. Professor Clay has also expressed himself as believing that this

identification is to be made; but no proof has hitherto been found for the belief. The name of the god Yah is variously written in Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions, *a-u, a-a, a-a-u, i-a, ia-u.* The god Ea is written both *ê-a* and *e-a.* The god Ea appears in Cappadocian names in both these forms: e. g., *Ê-a-dan,* and *E-a-šar.* Apparently the strongest evidence yet discovered that Ea = Yah is found in the writing of the name *E-a-šar* as *I-a-šar* in *BIN* IV, 6 : 13 / 9 : 5, 7, 11, 28 / 31 : 5, 11, 13 / NBC 3731 : 3, 6, 20. Unfortunately it can not be demonstrated absolutely that *Ea-šar* and *Ia-šar* represent the same individual, but since both appear as agents of Bushukin, it is highly probable that they are identical.

The name element Nin-Šubur

^{d}Nin-Šubur has the Semitic value ^{d}*Ĭ-lí-ab-rat* (cf. Deimel, *Pantheon Babylonicum,* p. 220). That it is to be read with this value in Cappadocian names is indicated by the following: Gimil-Ili-abrat, father of Puzur-Ishtar appears in NBC 1902 : 4 (case), as *Gimil-*^{d}*Nin-Šubur;* the same individual appears in NBC. 1762 : 9 as *Gimil-la-ab-ra-at.* The first syllable of ^{d}*Ĭ-lí-ab-rat* is here elided with the last syllable of *Gimil,* which incidentally gives evidence that *Gimil* is the correct reading of the sign *ŠÚ* as an element in personal names. For a fuller phonetic writing of the element *Nin-Šubur* cf. NBC 3676 : 17, *I-la-ab-ra-at-ba-ni.*

The month Ḫubur

The eleventh month in the list of old Assyrian months published by Ehelolf and Landsberger, *ZDMG* 74, p. 218, is *ḫibur* (*ḫubur*). The name of a Cappadocian month paralleling each of the old Assyrian months except this one has previously been found. The tablet NBC 1669 furnishes the name of the remaining month. Beginning with line 30, this tablet reads, *iš-du ḫa-muš-tim šá Bu-za-zu waraḫ ḫu-bur li-mu-um A-ku-tum,* "From the official period of Buzazu, the month Ḫubur, the eponymy of Akutum." Probably the same month name is an element in the Cappadocian personal name Gimil-hu-bur, "present of the month Ḫubur," but compare the phrase *Ummu ḫubur,* Creation Tablets III : 23, 81, etc.

FERRIS J. STEPHENS.

Culver-Stockton College,
Canton, Mo.

AARON EMBER, 1878-1926.

Dr. Aaron Ember, Professor of Egyptology at Johns Hopkins University, lost his life in a terrible tragedy which occurred at his residence at Windsor Hills, Baltimore, Md., in the early morning of May 31. He and Mrs. Ember had been entertaining friends until a late hour, and must have gone to sleep immediately after retiring. Apparently less than an hour after the guests had departed, chance passers-by noticed smoke pouring from the house, and attempted without success to arouse the family. Just what happened in that house after the inmates did awaken will never be known. Mrs. Ember, attempting to save her invalid six-year old son, was overcome and burned to death with her child before aid could reach her, and a similar fate overtook the maid. Professor Ember, fearfully burned, managed to reach the roof of the side porch, and was helped to the ground, where he was with difficulty restrained from rushing into the blazing house again in search of his wife and child. Fire engines which had been summoned arrived too late to save the lives of those left in the house. Professor Ember was hurried to the hospital where he died of his burns the following day. In the brief intervals in which he was fully conscious he could give very little account of the tragedy except that the family awoke to find the house in flames, and that Mrs. Ember told him to get the manuscript of the book he was writing while she saved Robert. Professor Ember is survived by two children, Theodore, twelve, and Ruth, ten years old, who happened to be visiting relatives on the night of the fire, and so escaped the fate of the other members of the family.

Professor Ember was born in Russia, Dec. 25, 1878. He came to America as a child of eight, and was educated in the public schools of Baltimore, graduating from the Baltimore City College in 1897. He entered Johns Hopkins in the fall of that year, took his Bachelor's degree in 1901 and his Doctor's degree in 1904, having served as Fellow in Semitic languages during the preceding year 1903-1904. From 1904-1910 he was Rayner Fellow in Semitic, during which period he became a regular member of the Fac-

ulty, being appointed Instructor in Semitic Languages in 1906, and Associate in 1909. In 1914 he was advanced to Associate Professor, which position he held until 1924, when in recognition of his Egyptological researches he was made Professor of Egyptology.

Professor Ember's work was concerned chiefly with the establishment of the fact that Egyptian is a member of the Semitic family of speech. He was the first to discover the phonetic laws which govern the relationship between Egyptian and Semitic, and to place the Semitic character of Egyptian beyond question. The value of these Egyptological investigations has been recognized by Oriental scholars both here and abroad.

Professor Ember's untimely death has broken the threads of a number of scientific activities, some of which can hardly continue without him. His *magnum opus* on the linguistic affinities between Egyptian and Semitic of which the first part dealing with the phonetic relations was in an advanced stage of preparation, though saved from the fire, is badly burned, and it may not be possible to accomplish anything like a complete restoration.

In conjunction with myself he was preparing a Hebrew Grammar intended to present not only the essential features of the language, but also the essence of the language itself. About a quarter of the material pertaining to this enterprise has been lost, but the work will be completed.

Professor Ember was co-editor with President Cyrus Adler of Dropsie College, Philadelphia, of the Haupt Anniversary Volume, a series of Oriental studies in honor of Professor Paul Haupt's fortieth year as Director of the Oriental Seminary of Johns Hopkins University. It seems that practically all the proof for this volume had been corrected and sent to the printer before the fire.

He was also co-editor with Dr. S. Schiffer of Paris of a new international Oriental Journal, *Oriens,* the first number of which had just appeared.

Professor Ember is the author of a number of articles on Semitic and Egyptian philology. His work on the *Pluralis Intensivus in Hebrew* and his numerous papers on Semito-Egyptian relations are

the most important. He has an extensive article on *Partial Assimilation in Egyptian* in the Haupt Anniversary Volume, and also one on *Egypto-Semitic Etymologies* in the first number of *Oriens*.

Professor Ember was prominent in Jewish educational circles in Baltimore. He was a Director of the Jewish Board of Education which exercises supervision over the various Talmud-Torah schools of the city. He was also deeply interested in the cultural side of Zionism, being thoroughly convinced of the importance for Judaism of the establishment of a center of Jewish life and activity in Palestine.

He was a confirmed book-lover, and had succeeded in accumulating what was probably one of the best Semitic libraries in this country. About half of this library was housed in his room at the University and so escaped destruction. That section which he kept at home is badly damaged, but not an utter loss, though what proportion of it is worth saving is still uncertain.

Professor Ember was imbued with true Hopkins enthusiasm for original research in his chosen field. On several occasions he received offers which were financially attractive, to teach Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic elsewhere, but in every case he preferred to remain where he was in order that he might be freer to follow his Egyptological investigations. He was an optimist and an idealist. He was always hoping for and expecting the best, and the principles that guided his actions were of the highest type. Good-nature, true kindliness, and loyalty to his ideals and his friends were striking attributes of his character.

His shocking death has created a void in the hearts of those who knew and loved him. Not only will he be sadly missed in the Oriental Seminary in which he worked for so many years, but the forces fighting in a materialistic age to uphold the essential importance of the humanities, will have been weakened by the loss of a faithful, self-sacrificing, and valiant seeker after truth.

FRANK R. BLAKE.

Johns Hopkins University.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

A Condensed Dictionary, English-Turkish, by A. VAHID BEY. Constantinople, and OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, American Branch, New York: 1924. 720 pp.

This book opens with an official testimonial from the Turkish Navy Department and a report of experts who are members of American educational institutions in Constantinople. In both documents this book is recommended in the most flattering way and, after examination, we must agree with the judgment expressed in them. This dictionary is a work to which the author has applied much knowledge and great labor. It is a very useful book of which people have long had need, because there has been no satisfactory English-Turkish dictionary, especially for the spoken, modern Turkish language, as distinct from the literary.

But even remarkable works have their defects, and some exist in our dictionary. In the first place, we cannot agree with the system of transliteration. This criticism is directed not only against the author, but also against the members of the Committee of experts, because the adopted system of transliteration "is the result of many discussions of the author with a committee of leading Turkish scholars of the American institutions in Constantinople." Many years ago a system of transliteration for Arabic, Persian, and Turkish languages was prepared by the best Orientalists in the world. This system has been published by the British Academy and approved by the International Congress of Orientalists. Moreover, this system is the standard transliteration in the United States and has been adopted by the Library of Congress at Washington. It therefore seems to me that it was not necessary to invent a new system and, if that of the British Academy is imperfect, it was enough to introduce some corrections. But such are not what we find in this new system.

For instance, in this transliteration "tree" = *āj* (instead of *aghāj,* as in the system of the Br. Ac.); but *āj* in Turkish means "hungry" which word our author transliterates by "*ach*"; it is not correct because our author himself writes "*ājuqmaq*" and not "*āchuqmaq*" (the same root "to hunger"). And if we write "*āch,*" hungry, it will be confused with "*āch,*" open! (Imperat. of to open).

Generally the transliteration of guttural *gh* is faulty. In the word "mountain" (*dāgh*) the author writes *dā,* but in "to scream" (*baghirmaq*), *bārmaq,* and omits not only *gh,* but also *i;* by his own transliteration we must write *bāurmaq.* Sometimes the author abandons his system and writes *agh* instead of *a,* e. g. *yaghuyor* (it rains).

Further we have *chojouqja,* childish (instead of *chojouqcha*). *Chojouqja* is a combination which is impossible of pronunciation; let the author pronounce *ja* after *q* and he will get inevitably *chojougja.*

We often have errors in the transliteration of the vowels. Is it possible that the author, a native Turk, does not see the different sounds represented by *u* in *dush qapu* (storm door, *dish qapou*)?

Mr. Vahid Bey says in his preface that "this work has been prepared chiefly for foreigners," and we think that all these questions of pronunciation will furnish many complications for foreigners.

Also we think the author's assertion is erroneous that "in Turkish as spoken today there is practically no accent." Till the present time in all the grammars, dictionaries, etc. we have always been told that the accent in the Turkish language is on the last syllable.

There are also some defects in translation. For example "pen-name," *namu müstear,* and "surname," *mahlas.* Permit me to remark that pen-name is *mahlas,* and if the author has doubts he can find it in *A History of Ottoman Poetry* by the late world-known orientalist E. J. W. Gibb. Although many new European words are in the dictionary of Vahid Bey, nevertheless there are many omissions. For instance, there is not "airplane" and for *tayyare* (airplane) we must look under "monoplane." "Radio" is also also missing, because *telsiz* means "wireless."

In spite of the defects which we have mentioned we must say that the work of Vahid Bey is the best among all the dictionaries of this kind. Our notes must not be offensive to the author, because he begins his preface by the following quotation: "un dictionnaire, on ne saurait trop le rédire, n'est jamais une œuvre parfaite."

N. N. Martinovitch.

Columbia University.

The Indian Buddhist Iconography, mainly based on the Sadhanamala and other (sic) *cognate Tantric texts of rituals.* B. BHATTACHARYYA. Oxford: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1924. Sm. qto; xxiv, xxix, 220 and 69 plates and index.

This is a well documented volume and will be indispensable to all scholars interested in Mahāyāna theology and in the identification of Mahāyāna, especially Vajrayāna deities. These deities are classified according to the Dhyāni Buddhas from whom they emanate.[1] Here, then, is not so much a polytheism as a polymorphic theism. As Śukrācārya remarks, the forms of deities are determined and produced by the relation which exists between the worshipper and the object of worship. So, too, a Hindu deity may be addressed as 'Thou that dost take the forms imagined by thy worshippers.' In the last analysis the forms are modes of thought and means by which it is sought to adumbrate, understand, and apprehend an impersonal Absolute. Mr. Bhattacharyya (p. 164) brings out this position in Buddhism very clearly, quoting the *Advayavajrasaṁgraha* as follows: 'The divinities are manifestations which are naturally non-existent. Wherever there is manifestation it must be Śunya in essence.' To take a specific instance; in *yab-yum* images, Śunya in the form of Heruka embraces Śunya in the form of Nairātma, and the dual image adumbrates the bliss of Nirvāṇa. This is, indeed, but a visual rendering of an idea already exressed in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* IV. 3 where the Brahman is explained by *ānanda,* in the original sense of the word.

The Sādhanamālā is a collection of descriptive formulae designed to be used by those who desire to evoke the mental image of a given deity for purposes of worship, or more especially, of plastic realisation in painting or sculpture. The artist (*sādhaka, mantrin* or *yogin*), in order to accomplish his purpose, must first effect an imaginative self-identification with the form evoked, and then only proceed to the handiwork. But surely the author is mistaken in supposing that only Buddhists believed in and practised such a self-identification with the deity. As Hindus say, *Devo bhūtvā,*

[1] This arrangement has a logical air, but inasmuch as the origins of many Buddhist divinities are unknown, and others are connected with more than one Dhyāni Buddha, a classification by types (Bodhisattvas, Tārās, Lokapālas, etc.) would have been much more convenient.

devam yajet: and already in the *Yoga-sūtras,* we find that while in normal life the self takes the form of the fluctuations of the mind-stuff, in concentration there must be 'identification of consciousness with the presented idea' and 'fusion with the nature of the object to be contemplated,' and devotion to the deity is specially mentioned as providing a suitable object for the practice. And as Śukrācārya remarks, it is *only* from mental vision that the imager should establish the images to be set up in temples. The truth is that scarcely anything in Indian religious experience or method is sectarian, except the specific theologies. A well known example of this is the simultaneous appearance of iconolatry in Hinduism and Buddhism as a result of the development of 'loving devotion' (*bhakti*).

Another point on which we disagree with the author is connected with the *Brahma-kapāla* carried by certain Buddhist deities. Mr. Bhattacharyya supposes that in this way 'the Buddhists attempted to exhibit the superiority of their gods over those of the Brāhmaṇical faith.' This ill accords with the Buddhist-Hindu *entente* so characteristic of the Tantric period, and reads like the suggestion of a Victorian missionary; the explanation is altogether too facile. If, as the author tells us, the colors, weapons and *āsanas* of the Buddhist deities all had 'deep spiritual meanings,' why not also in this case? And in fact Śiva himself is represented in more than one way as Brahmā-slayer. In the *Kūrma Purāṇa* he cuts off one of the five heads of Brahmā: he wears a (Brahmā-)kapāla in his hair, and often a garland of heads. Very likely the heads go back to Śiva's old connections with the burning ground, and may have received a subsequent interpretation, but certainly in Hindu mythology they seem to imply the nature of an eternal being, who in the course of his cosmic activity must terminate the lives of the Brahmās of innumerable *kalpas,* and some such meaning is probably to be sought in Buddhist symbology also, where it is probably a borrowing from Śaivism. And what about the Buddhist divinity known as Buddhakapāla?

So again in the case of Parṇaśavarī, and others who trample upon Gaṇeśa. It is not likely that this represents 'animosity to Hinduism,' but a misunderstanding of a Hindu type. Gaṇeśa is Vighneśvara, the master and remover of difficulties: but if as Mr. Bhattacharyya says the Buddhists called him Vighna, 'obstacle,'

it is easy to understand that they might have imagined a form of some deity, represented as overcoming the 'obstacle.'

Most of the illustrations consist of drawings, new or old, which have only an elucidatory value: others are from photographs of ancient sculptures, in some cases of importance as works of art, and we are glad to have these properly identified.

The volume is well printed, bound and indexed, but contains too many typographical errors, far more indeed than are given in the list of errata.

ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY.

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

The Song of Songs. A Symposium by MAX L. MARGOLIS, JAMES A. MONTGOMERY, WALTER WOODBURN HYDE, FRANKLIN EDGERTON, THEOPHILE J. MEEK, and WILFRED H. SCHOFF, editor. Philadelphia, THE COMMERCIAL MUSEUM, 1924. 120 pp.

This volume contains six papers presented to the Oriental Club of Philadelphia, May 10, 1923. 'How the Song of Songs entered the Canon' is discussed by Margolis. In so far as the question is answered at all, it is by two important suggestions. The notion of canonicity has itself a history, and there may have been rival canons. It is worth while following up these hints. But our limitations should be recognized. The history of the canon is the history of the criticism of the canon. Our knowledge of a fixed canon begins with the recorded debates among the rabbis as to whether this or that book "made the hands unclean," possessed such a sanctity as to render necessary a ritual ablution of the hands after contact with them before profane objects were touched. This Pharisaic custom naturally led to a critical movement by which the number of books publicly read or especially cherished was reduced and arranged in a definite order. The latter half of the second century of our era seems to mark the end of the process. Beyond the period in which these questions were discussed we cannot go except by conjecture. Nevertheless, we cannot help asking what kind of sanctity was ascribed to certain books, and how it came to be attached to them, before the custom arose and the consequent critical sifting. The prevalent idea of an early canon, understood precisely as it was

in later times, into which books were formally admitted by some authoritative body, rests on insecure foundations. Margolis questions, on good grounds, the position of many critics who assume such a canonization, first of the Law, then of the Prophets, and finally of the Writings, and seeks to explain Daniel's place in the third division by its having been written after the completion of the prophetic canon. Cp. my articles 'Canon, Critical View' in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia,* and 'Daniel' in the *Encyclopaedia Americana.* In very early times certain utterances, oral or written, were considered as sacred because they were looked upon as inspired. "A torah taught, a prophetic word spoken, a song sung, each of the three genres was regarded as a work of inspiration." Hence the author infers that "the three parts of the canon originated simultaneously and each grew to its present dimensions by long evolution." There can be no doubt as to the evolution; but the equal length of this evolution may be questioned. It is difficult to suppose that any part of the Writings goes back to the days of the earliest law-codes or prophetic oracles. More significant is the suggestion as to a rivalry between priests and prophets, priests and priests, prophets and prophets, strictly religious and more secular *mashal* poets. So far as priests and prophets are concerned, we know of such rivalry in the royal period. "Each camp," says Margolis, "had its canon, its standard of classicity." This is indeed plausible, and though it may be difficult to prove, it would be well to look more closely for possible indications. "The canon in its beginnings was more elastic, secularism had not yet been submerged . . . . and so the Song of Songs must be taken to have been admitted into the canon at an early date when the later and more rigorous notions had not yet obtained." The underlying assumption is that Canticles was written at an early date and that this book of a secular *mashal* poet successfully ran the race through the centuries against more rigorous notions. It would seem to be a simpler view that the growing regard for the great personalities of the past, legislators, historians, prophets, poets, seers, and sages, tended to increase the authority, credibility, significance, sanctity, and respectability of whatever documents were reputed as having come from their pen. The number of late books ascribed to Solomon shows how easily such "classicity" could be acquired.

Montgomery writes on "The Song of Songs in Early and Mediaeval Christian Use." He thinks that "the breasts of the Father" in *Odes of Solomon,* XIX, may be a reminiscence of the Greek rendering in Cant. i, 2, though it is strange that these mystical Odes should be so utterly independent in language and imagery of Cant., if the author knew the Song and interpreted it allegorically. Montgomery has rightly called attention to Hippolytus as a predecessor of Origen. The mixture of spiritual and secular songs in the Vienna MS. of the 12th century is an interesting analogy to the Babylonian songs found at Assur. The exquisite poem printed on p. 28 f. is certainly secular, and even the language of the closing stanza has little in common with Cant. ii, 12. "Greek Analogies to the Song of Songs" are described by Hyde. It is a matter of gratification to the present writer that the interpretation he gave in *The Messages of the Poets,* 1911, has been so ably supported and further strengthened by an eminent classical scholar. Hyde is probably right in finding a greater similarity in form between Cant. i, 9 ff. and the 27th Ode of Theocritus than between it and the 18th Ode, though the latter has quite naturally been often cited since Grotius first referred to it as a sample of *oaristys,* or fond discourse of lovers. In connection with the ever-recurrent allegorical interpretation of Canticles, Edgerton's discussion of 'The Hindu Song of Songs' is interesting. Many attempts have been made to find a hidden meaning in the Gita Govinda, not apparent on the surface. This beautiful poem, written in Sanskrit by Jayadeva in the 12th century, has more of a unity than Canticles. It consists of a series of dialogues, in which Krishna, his mistress Radha, and a female attendant take part. Edgerton emphasizes, however, that "it is not a drama, but a sort of lyric ballad." It seems to have been intended "at least partly as a work of religious devotion" chanting the love of an incarnate god whose divinity is not concealed; but it is purely erotic and sufficiently sensuous, and "no allegorical explanation is at all necessary." The longest and, in some respects, most important papers are those by Meek on 'The Song of Songs and the Fertility Cult' and Schoff on 'The offering Lists in the Song of Songs.' These are examined at length in my article entitled 'Is Canticles an Adonis Litany?' in this number of the JOURNAL.

There is a valuable Appendix, in which Meek gives a transliteration and translation of the Babylonian parallels to Canticles, KAR, No. 158. Whatever one may think of the theory he upholds, Schoff's learned observations on the spices are important and should be noted by interpreters of the book. It was a felicitous idea to bring together these papers which present some of the latest phases of the critical study devoted to what is still a somewhat puzzling collection of love-songs.

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT.

Cornell University.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

Steps are being taken for an arrangement with the printers of the JOURNAL to have the volumes bound, provided forty or fifty members will signify their desire to receive bound volumes at a small additional cost.

NOTES OF OTHER SOCIETIES

The first meeting of the recently incorporated MEDIAEVAL ACADEMY OF AMERICA was held on April 24, at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Newbury Street, Boston. President Montgomery conveyed to the President and Council the greetings of our own SOCIETY.

SOME MISUNDERSTANDINGS ABOUT INDIA[1]

WALTER EUGENE CLARK
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

IN MANY RECENT BOOKS, both by Indian and by western writers, is found the statement that the civilization of India is and always has been essentially spiritual. It is a wide-spread idea that Indian civilization has been completely dominated by mysticism and asceticism, by world-renouncing religions. The Indians are depicted as dreamy lotus-eaters who have been so engrossed with spiritual things, with questions of God, their souls, and their salvation, that they have paid a minimum of attention to worldly things. The facts of the matter are in sharp contradiction to the point of view just stated. Indian civilization has always been controlled by precisely the same combination of forces that has controlled western civilizations or any other civilization in the world. There never has been a people which has devoted itself, as a whole, exclusively to the practice of religion, which has directed its efforts exclusively to spiritual and non-worldly ends. This religious element has been only one factor in Indian life, and a much less important factor than is generally supposed. There have been millions whose lives have been dominated, in whole or in major part, by purely spiritual impulses, but these have never formed more than a small minority of the population as a whole. It is probably true that in India a religious sanction has been extended over more social matters than anywhere else in the world, but in the resulting synthesis of religious and social life which we call Hinduism most of these matters have become so stereotyped that they really have much less spiritual content than is commonly supposed. A merely nominal participation in external religious ceremonies does not necessarily imply a deep spiritual content.

One reason for the exaggerated emphasis which is often placed upon the spiritual element in Indian life is the fact that the only literature which has been preserved from the first thousand years or so of Indian literary history is almost entirely religious. Moreover, in dealing with the later period much more attention has

[1] Presidential Address delivered before the Society at Philadelphia, April 7, 1926.

been paid to the religious and philosophical literature than to the technical and secular literature. At the beginning of Indian studies attention was devoted largely to the study of the Sanskrit language itself. The study of Sanskrit played a very large part in the development of Comparative Philology. Simultaneously attention was turned to various attractive bits of the secular literature, and to the study of Indian religion and philosophy from the missionary point of view, or for their own intrinsic value, or as an aid to Comparative Religion. Even today in this country practically all of those who are able to devote themselves exclusively or largely to Indian studies owe their support to missionary activity, to comparative philology, or to the comparative study of religion. The time is just coming when the picture of Indian civilization must be painted on a larger canvas, when attention must be turned to the civilization of India as a whole and the part which it has played in world history and especially in the history of Asia. More and more Indian culture must be studied as a whole for its own sake and not merely as an appendage to philology or religion.

The fact that the Vedic literature, although containing some scanty historical information, is largely religious in content has led to a distorted treatment of the whole early period of Indian history. Such distortion, of course, is inevitable when the only historical documents are religious documents or works which have been heavily overlaid with professional religious elements. Suppose that nothing had been preserved in Europe from the first thousand years or so of the Christian era except the works of the Church Fathers and other religious texts, and suppose that the whole history of this period had to be reconstructed and described from these religious texts alone. It is apparent that our accounts of early European history would be much distorted. The situation in India is closely analogous to the one I have just described. We tend to exaggerate the influence of priests and monks in early Indian life as a whole just because they composed and preserved the religious literature of the time, and because this literature is all that has come down to us. There was, doubtless, much worldly activity outside of these professional religious circles, and it is by no means certain that all the intellectual or even literary activity was confined to the priests and monks. This religious literature, precious as it is, veils the actual history from us, and only a few things show through in

vague, blurred outlines. I might say in passing that the history of the Jews has often been distorted by too great a preoccupation with an essentially religious literature.

From the early centuries of the Christian era our preserved literature is no longer exclusively religious. There has come down to us a huge mass of literature dealing with mathematics, astronomy, astrology, medicine, poetics, architecture, sculpture, painting, grammar and language, alchemy or rudimentary chemistry, logic, music, dramaturgy, the art of love, minerals and gems, horses and elephants, lexicography, law and government, and other subjects of a practical and worldly nature. In all these matters the Indians have shown remarkable talents for patient observation and for accurate analysis and calculation. During this period Indian knowledge was on a par with that of Europe up to the development of modern science. I am becoming more and more of the opinion that the beginnings of some at least of this technical literature and of the secular literature in general (whether in Sanskrit or Prakrit) goes back some distance into the pre-Christian period. One of the pressing needs of Sanskrit scholarship is the making of adequate editions of the most important works of this technical literature and the preparation of detailed works on Indian *realien*. The field has hardly been scratched as yet. During the past three or four years I have had occasion to work systematically through Aryabhaṭa, Varāhamihira, Lalla, Brahmagupta, Bhāskara and other writers on astronomy and mathematics. The content and the intellectual nature of these works is a revelation to one who has spent most of his time in the reading of religious and philosophical texts.

We now know that the Indians were one of the greatest navigating and colonizing peoples of antiquity. From the first century of the Christian era, and probably from three or four centuries before that time, the so-called Indian ocean was in a very literal sense an Indian ocean. Throughout Indo-China from Burma to China and throughout the islands from Sumatra and Java to the Philippines Indian culture was the dominant factor. For more than a thousand years the whole of south-eastern Asia seems to have been as closely connected to India as were the Greek colonies in Sicily and on the Black Sea to the Greek motherland. We owe the recovery of these lost pages of Indian history to French and Dutch scholarship. Indians travelled freely to Arabia and Egypt,

but have left no clear, permanent traces of influence on the West. But in the Far East the whole civilization bears the imprint of Indian influence. Indian culture never succeeded in impressing itself strongly upon the West. Its expansion was eastwards. To the West, Indian trade seems to have been of rather a passive nature, controlled by Arabs and others. To the East, Indian trade seems to have been largely an active one. Here Chinese culture alone met Indian culture upon equal terms, but even so China borrowed from India much more than India borrowed from China. One need only compare the culture of the Han period with that of the Tang period to see how great an influence India had upon Chinese religion and art. The emotional and devotional elements in Mahāyāna Buddhism met a need which was not filled by Confucianism and Taoism. There were Indian colonies, Indian dynasties of kings, Indian architecture and art, Indian religion, and Indian codes of law and government all over the Far East. From the ninth to the eleventh century Angkor in Cambodia was one of the most magnificent and flourishing cities in the world. Its civilization was largely Indian. How much of a really Indian element there was in the population it is impossible to say. The inscriptions are Sanskrit, and Sanskrit literature in many of its branches, even the most technical, was widely studied. In the course of this eastward expansion of India no effort was made to found a great empire having its centre in India, although we now have inscriptional evidence for the despatch by the Cholas of a great fleet which won victories in Sumatra and on the Malay Peninsula.

The early Dutch traders in the Far East found that India alone would take any considerable quantity of European goods for cash. Elsewhere the insistent demand was for Indian goods. In order to carry on their commerce successfully European traders were forced to develop a great carrying trade between India and the Far East. This coastal trade bulked larger than the trade between the factories and their home country. As Moreland remarks, "it accounts for what is at first sight a puzzling phenomenon—that merchants who came to buy Eastern goods for Europe should devote so much of their energies to the conduct of purely Asiatic trade, carrying all sorts of merchandise from one Asiatic port to another, and dealing largely in markets which had little to offer

for shipment to Europe." In this matter the Europeans were merely following in the footsteps of the Arabs, and the Arabs themselves were merely following the trade routes and methods of trade developed by Indian traders centuries before.

It is curious that all of this eastward expansion of Indian culture has left so little trace upon our preserved Indian literature. But this fact serves only to emphasize the unhistorical character of Indian literature in general, not to prove the lack of practical ability and activity. For the most part Indian literature was Brahmanical, or the product of Buddhist and Jain monks, or the product of popular *bhakti* religious movements (especially in the south), or it was a court literature which interested itself little in history and trade. If not in Sanskrit one would expect some traces in Oriya, Telugu, and Tamil literature, for it seems to have been south-eastern India which was most closely in touch with the Far East. But even the early colonization of Ceylon which gave an Aryan basis to the Cinghalese language, and the large trade with the west which had its centre in the seaports on the north-western coast of India have left very little trace in our literature. Only the Roman trade with south-western India has left clear traces in Tamil works.

There is, however, much scattered material which proves the existence of elaborately organized trade guilds in India. There are many stories in Hindu, Buddhist, and Jain books which centre around caravans and voyages by sea. There is a fine opportunity for some student to collect and analyze all these more or less fabulous stories of sea voyages, and to compare them with corresponding Chinese and Arabian accounts. There are fragmentary Greek accounts, passages in Chinese and Arabic literature, and the recently discovered Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra. The last of these has done more than anything else to change our attitude towards early Indian civilization. Dahlmann has gone so far as to argue that in the above-mentioned guilds and in the organization of trade and industry in general we have the key to the whole formation of caste. This is, doubtless, a much exaggerated point of view, but the very exaggaration serves to draw attention more strongly to an important factor in Indian life which has been too much neglected. I have lately been much impressed in my reading of Sanskrit Buddhist literature and especially in the course of making a trans-

lation of the Divyāvadāna by the important part played by the guilds and by sea voyages in the thought and general life of early India.

The recovery of the political history of India and of its eastern colonies has been due almost entirely to the study of inscriptions. Compare for instance the account of the pre-Mohammedan period given by Elphinstone with that given in the first edition of Vincent Smith's Early History of India. Nothing could show more clearly the inadequacy of a history of India based entirely on a religious literature and on court poetry. The inscriptions contain many religious elements, but except for the inscriptions of Asoka they are not essentially religious in content. On the whole they give us a picture of a vigorous, objective, worldly life, of constant warfare and struggling between kingdoms for political supremacy, of a luxurious court life, and of a vigorous and efficient organization of government. These elements formed at least as important a part in Indian civilization as a whole as the quiet religious life and literature of those who were essentially spiritually minded. One of the most pressing needs of Indian scholarship is the completion of the long-planned Corpus of Indian inscriptions. These, for the most part, are now so inadequately edited or the publication is so scattered that it is very difficult for one who is not a trained epigraphist to make much use of them, and we shall need to make increasing study of them in every branch of Indian research. Their number is rapidly increasing. At present we have in Vincent Smith's work only the skeleton and bare bones of Indian history.

Those who emphasize the essentially spiritual side of Indian life forget the Kāmasūtra and the large quantity of later literature of the same type. They forget the large mass of lyric poetry and other literature in which the erotic element and the joy of physical living constitute the dominant element. In no other country in the world have the refinements of love on the physical side been worked out with such scientific or pseudo-scientific details. This is not a vagrant and random offshoot of literature, for elements of it are strongly marked in a very large part of the secular literature as a whole and even in some of the religious literature.

It is a frequent complaint in the religious and philosophical literature that the majority of men follow the Cārvāka point of view which considers wealth and enjoyment to be the only ends of

human activity. One of the common names for this system is Lokāyata which means "prevalent in the world." It is clear that the spiritual elements in Indian life were constantly struggling against the same elements which tend to drag down the spiritual elements in western civilization.

The Pañcatantra, the Kathāsaritsāgara, the Vetālapañcaviṅśati, the Śukasaptati, the *bhāṇas* and all the rest of the more popular literature of fables, tales, dramas, and so forth show that spiritual ideals formed only one factor in Indian life.

Most important of all is the fact, which is often overlooked, that the main current of Brahmanism and Hinduism was not directed towards the leading of an exclusively spiritual life in which attachment to worldly activity was reduced to a minimum. The thought of *varnāśramadharma* (the duties of castes and the various stages of life) is at the very basis of the religious and social system of Brahmanism and Hinduism. This involves the maintenance of family and social life, the keeping up of the whole social organization. Every man is supposed to carry out energetically the duties of the station in life into which he is born. Brahmanism and Hinduism have had strong political affiliations, and Brahman statesmen attached to kings have always shown great ability in the management of practical affairs. The Brahman caste, which was supposed to devote itself exclusively to religious functions, has not been able to maintain that ideal. The major part of the Brahman caste was forced gradually to give up such religious functions and to engage in other occupations. If spiritual ideals had been the dominant factor in the historical development of Indian society this dislocation would not have happened. The conception of a great body of priests and monks who should lead a purely spiritual life apart from *kāma* and *artha* has never been at the basis of the religious and social system of Hinduism. The spirit of renunciation is very strong in India and of course a place was found within the system for those who were strongly inclined to renounce the world and lead a purely spiritual life. But on the whole a man was supposed to live in the world and perform all the duties of his station in life until middle age or later. Then, his worldly duties done, he might become a hermit or *sannyāsī*. How often in our Brahman literature do a man's ancestors rebuke him for having renounced the world before he has begotten a son. In spite of the philosophical developments of Hinduism how large a part is played

by the idea that the welfare of the souls of the departed ancestors is dependent upon the continuance of the family. Salvation is, to be sure, the goal of Hinduism, but nevertheless men who without fulfilling their social duties spend their whole lives as *sannyāsīs* are really outside the main current of Hinduism. Buddhism and Jainism, of course, had different postulates. In the West the monastic ideal of life is still strongly marked in more than half of Christendom. If we had accurate statistics I wonder whether these men and women would not form nearly as great a percentage of our population as the real *sannyāsīs* do in India. Nobody would dream of saying that this deeply religious and spiritual ideal was the controlling influence in western civilization. I very much doubt whether it has been such in India.

It seems to me that the main current of Indian life, just as in the West, has been that of trying to strike a balance between the claims of *kāma, artha* and *mokṣa*. Although the last is deemed to be the most important goal of life, still the claims of the first two are not neglected, and bulk as large in the general treatment of religious and social problems as does the last. I am inclined to think that the breaking up of Hindu kingdoms and the foreign rule of the last few centuries has tended to develop a greater scholasticism of thought, and to concentrate attention and effort to a greater degree than formerly upon philosophy and religion. A recent writer on Indian history (I refer to Vaidya's *History of Mediaeval Hindu India*) sees in the prevalence of Buddhism and its insistence upon celibacy, the monkhood, and the purely spiritual life as the very basis of its religious and social system one of the chief reasons for the decline of Indian civilization and for foreign conquests. He says "The high esteem in which Buddhism held *sannyāsa* and the fact that it allowed people of all castes, men and women, to flock to the fold of the recluses and pass a life of idleness and begging spread among the people a sense of carelessness about their political condition and worldly prosperity." His elaboration of this and his other statements gives room for much comment and criticism. I refrain here from criticism. I quote him merely to illustrate the reaction of a Hindu critic to the course of mediaeval Indian history and the part played in it by Buddhism.

India has been no more successful in striking a balance between *nivṛtti* and *pravṛtti* (a purely spiritual life and a life of worldly activity) than has the West, although India has probably carried

over more religious elements into its treatment of an active worldly life than has the West. Indian civilization has been much less spiritual than is commonly supposed and the West has been much less materialistic than India thinks. Not all the energy of India has been directed towards a purely spiritual goal or even towards the external religious ceremonies of sacrifice and temple worship. We must emphasize the economic life and the development of industry which, for many centuries, made India one of the greatest industrial and trading countries in the world. We must emphasize Indian political organization and the constant struggle of her kings and nobles for political supremacy. The strong development of nationalism which has been taking place in India during the past generation or more is not based primarily upon spiritual ideals. Political and economic factors of a practical and worldly kind are the dominating ones. We must emphasize Indian technical literature and its purely intellectual attainments. We need more work on the neglected subject of Indian *realien*. The perpetuation of the family, the maintenance of social institutions and of government, the creation and enjoyment of wealth, trade, intellectual efforts of all kinds outside the fields of religious and philosophical speculation have played a much greater rôle in Indian history than most people think. Most of the elements which differentiate the India of the present from the West of the present have developed during the last two or three hundred years, and they are not all to be traced to Indian spirituality or to western materialism. A deeper analysis than these easy catchwords is needed. There is a Sanskrit proverb to the effect that to one who wears shoes the whole earth is covered with leather. Only to one who is shod with a purely religious or philosophical point of view is the whole of Indian civilization explainable by the catchwords religious and spiritual.

What I have said will not be new to those of you who have read widely in Sanskrit literature as a whole and have been following the recent trend of Indian studies. Please do not think that I mean to deny that many, very many of India's greatest men have been her religious teachers and philosophers, or that I minimize the part which has been played by these men in Indian history. But we must treat Indian history as a whole, and place the various formative elements in their proper perspective.

THE ORIGINAL RĀMĀYANA

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS
YALE UNIVERSITY

THE VERY WELCOME TEXT of the North Western Recension of the Rāmāyaṇa adds much to our knowledge of the poem as a whole. Despite the scanty material thus far available, for the publication "drags its slow length along" at the rate of only a few fasciculi per annum, it is yet possible to utilize the new text for a better comprehension of the epic problem in general than was afforded even by the valuable introduction given his work by Professor Jacobi years ago in *Das Rāmāyaṇa,* a book of great learning and of keen insight.

There is frequent mention in the works of the Mahratti saints of comparatively recent date of an *ādi*-Rāmāyaṇa, from which they profess to draw their citations and make paraphrases, as has been demonstrated by Dr. Abbott, though on the surface these citations appear to coincide well enough with one or the other of the accepted texts without exactly following either the Bombay or Bengal version. But the North Western text raises the question whether there ever was an *ādi*-Rāmāyaṇa. This heretical suspicion I will seek to justify by an examination of a few passages (as already published in that recension) and a comparison between them and the corresponding readings in the other recensions.

The abrupt beginning of the NW text, *kasyacit tv atha kālasya* (in a sentence meaning "after some time king Daśaratha summoned his son Bharata, son of Kekayī, and said to him"), coinciding with the beginning of the seventy-seventh and seventy-ninth chapters, respectively, of Bāla and Ādi (Bomb. and Beng. texts), suggests that the whole first book is a later addition; but the abruptness must imply that some unknown matter lies back of this beginning, which may perhaps be left for later publication. To proceed with NW 11 = Bomb. 9, Beng. 8: Beng. and NW after 1a interpolate to 8 (= Bomb. 3) with unimportant variations, but note in NW and Beng. (1b) alone the expression *jāne te bhaktim uttamām.* Bomb. 4 = NW Beng. with slight but significant variants: Bomb. has *evam uktā tu sā devyā Mantharā pāpadarśinī, Rāmārtham upahiṅsantī Kaikeyīm idam abravīt;* Beng.

has *evam uktā tayā devyā . . pāpaniścayā, vākyaṃ duḥkhāya Rāmasya* and this is the text of NW, while the close of the section has several *upendras* in Bomb. but not in NW Beng. In Bomb. 10-11 = Beng. 9, there are more descriptive verses in Bomb. (e. g. Bomb. 31 goes only to Beng. 10); 28 in Bomb., *kenā 'bhiyuktā 'si* = Beng. 7, *abhiśastā'si* gives the same idea in a different compound, a point so slight as to be easily overlooked, but of fundamental importance in determining the "original" text.

Before taking this point into consideration, however, it is necessary to warn against a too hasty inference from the example of concord just given between Beng. and NW. On the whole the NW text is nearer to Beng. than to Bomb., but exceptions are not far to seek. One of these follows immediately where a list of peoples expands the simple mention of the realm in all three texts and NW alone follows Bomb., though with different readings, as follows: Bomb. (10, 37):

Draviḍāḥ Sindhusauvīrāḥ Saurāṣṭrā Dakṣiṇāpathāḥ
Vaṅgāṅgamagadhā Matsyāḥ samṛddhāḥ Kāśikośalāḥ

NW:

Prācyāś ca Sindhusauvīrāḥ Surasā (v. l. *Surāṣṭra-*)*-vartayas tathā,*

with *deśāḥ* for *Matsyāḥ* in the next hemistich. Yet at the close of the exhortation following, where Bomb. has *sarve śṛṇvantu daivatāḥ* (11. 16) and Beng. (28b) has *tan me śṛṇuta devatāḥ*, our NW text follows Beng. and not Bomb.; as in the preceding hemistich Beng. has *satyasandho mahārājā dharmajñaḥ susamāhitaḥ*, NW has the same except for *mahābhagō* instead of *mahārājā* (sic), and Bomb. has *satyasandho mahātejā dharmajñaḥ satyavāk śuciḥ*.

It is to be regretted that the editor has found the MSS marked as 7-12 (inclusive) to be "too divergent" to be collated after the fourth sarga. The first of this group, by the way, calls the Bālakaṇḍa the Bālacarita and includes it in Ayodhyā. A tendency to coincide with the Bengal version distinguishes the MSS 1-3, of which 5-6 are a sub-group, and this tendency would have become more capable of being handled critically if the divergences had all been noted. In the very first sarga it becomes a question of manuscript authority whether we are to read with nearly all manuscripts

gamane 'tha matiṃ cakre or assume as correct the reading of one MS (ṭī) which has the older Beng. (79, 4b) reading, *gamanāyo 'pacakrāma* or (with Bomb. 77, 180) *gamanāyā 'bhicakrāma.* But we must do as well as we can with what the editor has given us. And a second observation immediately presents itself, namely, that in the frequent cases where NW stands with Beng. rather than with Bomb., there is no uniformity as regards that agreement. For example, the second sarga, where NW corresponds to Beng. 80 and describes how Bharata and Śatrughna are instructed in science and how Bharata sends greetings to his parents, has thirty-two ślokas in each text while Bomb. has nothing of the sort; only the general meaning is quite the same in NW and Beng. Thus Bharata explains what sort of teachers he wishes to have, " those who know writing, forms, and words, proficient in regard to works on polity and practical affairs, and in regard to elephants, horses, cars, and wagons, clever in Gandharvavidyā (magic), and learned in different arts . . well-trained old Brahmans learned in the Veda " and so forth, as NW has it, while Beng. has " proficient in *dharma, artha, jñāna* and acquainted with writing and counting, *lekhyasaṅkhyāvidas,* proficient in regard to arrows and darts and versed in works on polity, in regard to elephants (etc. as above), and others proficient in the meaning of Veda, Vedāṅga, and Nyāyaśāstra." After this slight but marked difference the texts are similar though still not the same (e. g. 8 = Beng. 7, *paṭhane,* v. l. *grahaṇe,* " absorbed in reciting " or " absorbed in learning " the texts), as if two different persons were giving substantially the same account but each in his own words, e. g. NW 2, 11 = Beng. 9, as a result of this training: NW sets down

so 'nupūrveṇa tān sarvān parijagrāha suvrataḥ
saha bhrātrā mahātejāḥ Śatrughnena yaśasvinā

and Beng. has

ānupūrvyā hi śāstrāṇām āgame bhṛśam udyataḥ
vidyānāṃ ca saśilpānāṃ Śatrughasahitas tadā.

The matter is unimportant in detail; it sums up the preceding. Bharata and Śatrughna both studied hard and became proficient in their scholarship; what matter how this is worded precisely? Such seems to be the implication. But after 15 (= Beng. 13), which says in slightly different words that when Bharata had be-

come acquainted with all sciences he desired to learn the real meaning of what he had memorized, it is recorded in NW that he began to cultivate all the twice-born who were expert in *dharma,* since he wished to learn "from aged Brahmans and Bhikṣus," which does not appear in Beng. at all, nor does the neighboring phrase (16 and 18) *tapo 'hiṅsāratāḥ,* which conjointly may hint at Buddhistic teachers. This is followed by another of these baffling descriptions of simple content and duplicate form (21):

Bengal Recension	*North-Western Recension*
tadā 'sya buddhiḥ saṃjajñe	*tasya buddhiḥ samabhavat*
dūtam preṣayitum pituḥ	*pituḥ sampreṣaṇam*[1] *prati*
athā 'hūyā 'bravīd vṛddhaṃ	*saṃdideśa tadā dūtam*
suhṛdam brahmavādinam	*brāhmaṇaṃ śubhalakṣaṇam*
Ayodhyāṃ gaccha bhadraṃ te	*Ayodhyāṃ gaccha bhadraṃ te*
tvarito javanair hayaiḥ	*dūta śīghraṃ nṛpottamam*
pitaraṃ tatra Kauśalyām	*pitaraṃ kuśalam brūhi*
brūyās tvam mātaraṃ ca me	*mātṛś ca bhrātarau tathā*
mātāmahakule cā'pi	*pṛṣṭvā ca kuśalaṃ tebhyo*
yathā vartāmahe vayam	*vācyo Daśarathaḥ prabhuḥ*
brūyāś ca . . Kauśalyām abhi-	*mātāmahagṛhe tāta*
vādanam.	*vartate* (v. l. *varte 'ham*) *tvadanu-*
	grahāt
	yathā 'jñaptaṃ kṛtaṃ tāta
	mahat tava śubham priyam (v. l.
	kṛtam).

It is obvious that in Beng. the first Kauśalyām has taken the place of *kuśalam,* as the greeting to K. occurs later. The Beng. text is expanded in the matter of greetings (omitted above), but this is a small matter. The important point is that the text as a whole occurs in these two versions only (not in Bomb.), but with differences which may be roughly expressed in translation thus: "then he got the idea of sending a messenger to his father," "then he had the idea as to sending"; "and summoning him he thus addressed a venerable kindly priest," "as messenger he com-

[1] The editor has admitted the reading *saṃprekṣaṇam,* but the v. l. *saṃpreṣaṇam* is required by the sense, by the *preṣayitum* of Beng., and by the fact that no such word as *saṃprekṣaṇam* exists.

missioned a Brahman having lucky signs"; *etc.*, so that, except for the one phrase "go to Ayodhyā, blest be thou" (a conventional expression) there is only a loose conformity of words and even this phrase is not sustained, one text adding "hastening on with rapid steeds" and the other having "(go) O messenger, to the king in haste."

It is not my intention to discuss in detail the varied reading of the new text but only to draw from certain selected passages such historical inferences as seem to be justified. The loose agreement of sense and words resolves itself into what is on the one hand a substantial agreement in meaning for any one śloka with a complete or partial disagreement in the form of expression. Therewith comes in addition the pregnant fact that either text is liable anywhere to embellish or at least add to the text by means of supplementary stanzas not found at all in the alternate text. This then is carried so far that supplementary passages long enough to make an extra sarga are sometimes added in the same way. In the passage just cited, an episode of 32 ślokas entirely lacking in the Bombay recension is handled with this verbal freedom in the Bengal and North-Western recensions. The general content is identical; the manner of expressing that content is quite different. There is not the slightest use in trying to get at the original form of this episode. No comparison of the varied readings in the two versions will enable one to discover the *ādi*-form.

To understand how this can be, several items of historical moment must be appreciated. In the first place, these plastic verses are not art-forms. In the unstudied narrative style of the epic there is very rarely any attempt to produce a combination of words which is artistic. There are precious few verses, for example, in the whole Mahābhārata which show any attempt to play with words in an attractive manner, to express sense by special syllables onomatopoetically, or to invent felicitous verbal combinations arresting to the ear. For the most part the verse, which is as near prose as verse can be, sweeps on in a continual stream of story-telling, the text being chosen not to please with sound but to proceed with a tale as monotonously recounted as the battle-scenes of Homer, where choice words are not important, but the interest lies in the succession of events recorded. In the second place, the epic narrator is no *dūta* or caste-herald trained to deliver his mes-

sage as *verba ipsissima* of his lord, but a man who has certain things to say at a certain place, or at some place, in his general narrative and says them more or less in his own words, intent not on the form of words but on their graphic and historical value. He feels at liberty to say what he has to say as he will, and even where he will,[2] if only he says clearly what belongs to the passage. Whether he expresses the idea of *tasya buddhiḥ samabhavat pituḥ sampreṣaṇam prati* in exactly these words or in the form *tadā 'sya buddhiḥ saṃjajñe dūtam preṣayitum pituḥ*, is a matter of complete indifference to himself and to his audience!

Another illustration. NW 36 = Beng. 33 and Bomb. 33 is in all texts substantially the same but with many *variae lectiones*, though unusually noticeable in the more exact agreement between the Bengal and NW recensions. Thus both (vs. 16) describe Rāma as Lokanātha, not in the Bombay text, and the six qualities of Rāma in Bomb. 12 are

ānṛśaṅsyam anukrośaḥ śrutaṃ śīlaṃ damaḥ śamaḥ
(Rāghavaṃ śobhayanty ete ṣaḍ guṇāḥ puruṣarṣabham)

whereas in NW and Beng. 14 alike they are

ānṛśaṅsyaṃ kṣamā śīlaṃ śrutaṃ satyam parākramaḥ
(śobhayanti guṇā Rāmam ete suprathitā bhuvi).
[Beng. has *ete ṣaṭ prathitā*]

There follows immediately the lament of the people, which appears as below in the two texts of the Bombay and Bengal recensions respectively (the slight variations of NW 36 are noted under Beng.): Bombay (ii. 33, 13-17):

tasmāt tasyo 'paghātena prajāḥ paramapīḍitāḥ
audakānī 'va sattvāni grīṣme salilasaṃkṣayāt
pīḍayā pīḍitaṃ sarvaṃ jagad asya jagatpateḥ
mūlasye 'vo 'paghātena vṛkṣaḥ puṣpaphalopagaḥ
mūlaṃ hy eṣa manuṣyānāṃ dharmasāro mahādyutiḥ
puṣpaṃ phalaṃ ca patraṃ ca śākhāś cā 'sye 'tare janāḥ

[2] The dislocation of certain episodes, appearing in one text before and in another after another episode, points to a narrative freedom in the enumeration of incidents. Sometimes the same incident appears, as Jacobi has noticed, in two places in the same text, but told in slightly different words.

te Lakṣmaṇa iva kṣipraṃ sapatnyaḥ sahabāndhavaḥ
gacchantam anugacchāmo yena gacchati Rāghavaḥ
udyānāni parityajya kṣetrāṇi ca gṛhāṇi ca
ekaduḥkhasukhā Rāmam anugacchāma dhārmikam.

Bengal (ii. 33, 15-20):

vivāsenā 'sya tenā 'yaṃ duḥkhito 'dya mahājanaḥ (NW has *vivāsenādya tenāsya*)
audakānī 'va sattvāni salilasya parikṣayāt
lokanāthasya Rāmasya pīḍayā pīḍitaṃ jagat
aparvaṇī 'va somasya Rāhugrahaṇapīḍayā (NW—*grahanipīḍayā*)
ayaṃ sa dātā bhogānām paritrāṇasukhasya ca (NW *paribhoga-prasādānām*)
tathā 'bhayapradānasya dātā gacchati no vanam
sādhu Lakṣmaṇavat sarve tyaktabhogaparigrahāḥ
Rāmam evā 'nugacchāmaḥ kiṃ no dārair dhanena vā
saputradhanadārā vā sapaśudravyasaṃcayāḥ (NW *śca* for *vā*)
gacchāmas tatra yatrā 'yaṃ sādhur gacchati Rāghavaḥ (NW *sādhu*)
vihāro 'dyānaśayanaśaraṇāsanasādhanam
parityajyā 'nugacchāmas tulyaduḥkhā nṛpātmajam

One sees almost at once how the matter works out. A few phrases identical or nearly so, a slight "improvement" by substituting *lokanātha* for *jagatpati,* the old metaphor abandoned in favor of a fresh simile, then the return to the burden of the song "we will follow him where he goes." In other words, a suggestion that in this particular passage we have an older text of sorts slightly revamped. But what shall we say of the following verses, where both texts fill up or distend a simpler passage descriptive of the desolation anticipated in the event of the people following the prince? This simpler passage is conserved in both texts in identical words of clauses afterwards separated by divergent attempts to embellish the old matter. Thus Bomb. and Beng. both begin with the words *samuddhṛtanidhānāni* and then after two and three hemistichs, respectively, continue with *parityaktāni daivataiḥ* to which Beng. adds at once the gist of the whole matter

asmattyaktāni veśmāni Kaikeyī pratipadyatām
vanaṃ nagaram evā 'stu yatra gacchati Rāghavaḥ

which in Bomb. appear verbatim (except *yena* for *yatra*) but only after four more unnecessary descriptive hemistichs concerning the deserted homes "infested with mice and snakes running about out of their holes, homes deprived of water-libations and incense and purification and all religious activities (*pranaṣṭabalikarmejyāmantrahomajapāni ca*) and with utensils broken as by an evil Fate." But one hemistich here makes one of those (almost the same) that appear in Beng. in the first group of separated clauses, *prakṣiṇadhanyakoṣāni* (*hīnasaṃmārjanāni ca*) instead of *apetodakadhūmāni hīna*—etc. The Bomb. text has at 22c-d a hemistich immediately following *yena gacchati Rāghavaḥ* (above) which appears in the same words in NW, *asmābhis tu parityaktam puraṃ sampadyatām vanam,* which is slightly changed and expanded along the lines already given (Beng. 24):

araṇyatām parityaktam asmābhir yātv idam puram
yatra vatsyati Rāmo 'yam puraṃ tatra bhaviṣyati

The following verses show the same colloquial variations as noted above, with an apparent expansion of the text in Bomb. without change of meaning till the finale is reached in the two texts:

Bomb.: *ity evaṃ vividhā vāco nānājanasamīritāḥ*
śuśrāva Rāghavaḥ śrutvā na vicakre 'sya mānasam
Beng.: *etāś cā 'nyāś ca vividhā vācaḥ paurajaneritāḥ*
śṛṇvan Rāmo vayau mārge vanavāsakṛtodyamaḥ.

Again the words change but the content remains. What possible criterion will give us the "original" form? What was original was the sense, not the precise words in which the sense was conveyed. All our classical notions of a fixed original from which manuscripts vary by the slightest alterations vanish into thin air before such freedom of transmission as is instanced here. And then the tag at the end of the chapter immediately following this verse. Bomb. prefaces it with a couple more ślokas explaining that Rāma, who was *mattamataṅgavikramaḥ,* went to his mother's apartment which was *Kailāsaśikharaprabham* (two common iterata of epic verse) and then:

pratīkṣamāṇo 'bhijanaṃ tadārtam anārtarūpaḥ prahasann ivā 'tha
jagāma Rāmaḥ pitaraṃ didṛkṣuḥ pitur nideśaṃ vidhivac cikīrṣuḥ

which Beng. has without introduction and with merely the slight change in d of *satyapratijñam nṛpatim* (v. l. *pitaram*) *cikīrṣuḥ;* after which Bomb. has

tat pūrvam aikṣvākasuto mahātmā Rāmo gamiṣyan nṛpam ārtarūpam
vyatiṣṭhata prekṣya tadā Sumantram pitur mahātmā pratihāraṇārtham
pitur nideśena tu dharmavatsalo vanapraveśe kṛtabuddhiniścayaḥ
sa Rāghavaḥ prekṣya Sumantram abravīn nivedayasvā 'gamanam nṛpāya me

and Bengal:

āsādya ce 'kṣvākakulapradīpo Rāmaḥ pitur veśma tadāryavṛttaḥ
vyatiṣṭhata prekṣya tato niyoge sthitaṃ Sumantram pratihāram iṣṭam.

It is as if certain catch-words were remembered by two transmitters, who put in what they could recall of the words but were intent mainly on transmitting the message as a whole.

The whole of the next chapter contained in NW 37 and Beng. 34 is omitted in Bomb. The text of the two agreeing recensions is substantially the same though there are slight variations and omissions (NW omits Beng. 16b-17a and the hemistich after 20b) and the three texts unite again in the next passage (Bomb. 34; Beng. 35; NW 38) though verbal similarity is still largely lacking. Compare, for example, Sumantra's address in Bomb. and Beng.

(Bomb.)

brāhmaṇebhyo dhanaṃ dattvā sarvaṃ cai 'vopajīvinām
sa tvām paśyatu bhadraṃ te Rāmaḥ satyaparākramaḥ
sarvān suhṛda āpṛchya tvāṃ hī 'dānīṃ didṛkṣate
gamiṣyati mahāraṇyaṃ tam paśya jagatīpate
vṛtaṃ rājaguṇaiḥ sarvair ādityam iva raśmibhiḥ

(Beng.)

dattvā dvijebhyaḥ svadhanam bhṛtyebhyaś co 'pajīvanam
svaraśmibhir ivā 'dityaḥ khyāto loke guṇāṅśubhiḥ
ājñāṃ te śirasā 'dāya vanaṃ gantuṃ kṛtakṣaṇaḥ
Lakṣmaṇena saha bhrātrā Sītayā ca narādhipa
draṣṭuṃ te 'bhyāgataḥ pādau taṃ paśya yadi manyase, etc.

Here indeed the texts "unite again," but in what manner do

they unite? The situation is identical, the content of each passage is the same, yet the words are quite different: "Giving all his property to Brahmans and those dependent upon him, Rāma the hero of truth should see thee, blest be thou; having bid all his friends farewell he now seeks to see thee; into the great forest will he go; O lord of the world, see thou him encompassed with all royal qualities like the sun with its beams," as compared with: "To the twice-born giving his property all and a means of livelihood to his servants,[3] like the sun with its rays glorious in the world with his rays of good qualities, taking upon his head thy command, impatient to go to the wood, with his brother Lakṣmana and with Sītā, O lord of men, he has approached thy feet to see thee; see him, if thou art so minded."

We have here precisely the same sort of concordant discord that appears when the Rig Veda verse *sahasrākṣeṇa śataśāradena . . . śataṃ yathemaṃ śarado nayātīndraḥ* appears in the Atharva Veda as *sahasrākṣeṇa śatavīryeṇa . . . Indro yathainaṃ śarado nayāty ati*, etc. (RV 10, 161, 3 = AV. 3, 11, 3). In some form or other the text must have originally appeared but only to be modified in more or less degree by successive repeaters and alterers, who wished to preserve the substance but were not much troubled in regard to the exact form. The meticulous care later lavished on the Vedic texts preserved them from continual disintegration of this sort and conserved the words as conscientiously as the meaning. But no such care ever bothered the repeaters of epic verse any more than today it worries the repeaters of popular quotations. "When Greek meets Greek" is not a true quotation but it does as well as "When Greek joins Greek" and facilis descensus Averni has almost superseded the original Averno.

Let it be conceded that Vālmīki originally composed a Rāmāyaṇa. But when he himself began to repeat the verses in which he had enshrined the tale he probably varied them in unessentials, such for example as (above) *viprebhyaḥ* for *dvijebhyaḥ*, and no sooner had his poem become the public property of rhapsodes and bards than this process began to affect whole clauses and verses and,

[3] Perhaps rather "giving to twice-born and to servants his property all (as) a means of livelihood." The NW text (38, 4 = Beng. 35, 4 = Bomb. 34, 6) has *dattvā dhanāni viprebhyo bhṛtyebhyaś co 'pajīvanam*, but otherwise has exactly the Beng. words.

further, the original text began to be expanded partly for the sake of beautifying it and partly for the sake of inculcating moral and religious teachings. Of the latter sort (not to speak of the whole seventh book) are those additions which emphasize the religious importance of the hero; he becomes Lokanātha (etc., above). Both intentions are combined in passages where, for example, Ganges is extolled and verses are obviously added in honor of the goddess as well as to describe the river. Thus the Bomb. text adds twelve verse to the text, as accepted by Beng. and NW, describing the passage of the Ganges in Bomb. 2, 50, 12, seq. = Beng. 47, 1 and NW 51, 1, some bits of which appear (not as wholes) in the other texts, but only Bomb. 24b has the significant hemistich *Viṣṇupādacyutāṃ divyām apāpām pāpanāśinām* (*Gaṅgām*). This whole section is an admirable illustration of the way the text has been handed down. The scene in itself is unimportant. Rāma crosses the Ganges and meets the Niṣāda king Guha, with whom he talks and by whom he lets his horses be cared for. The simplest text is that of NW:

tatas tripathagāṃ Gaṅgāṃ śītatoyām aśaivalām
dadarśa Rāghavaḥ puṇyāṃ divyāṃ ṛṣiniṣevitām.

Bomb. replaces *Gaṅgām* with *divyām* and in the second hemistich has *Gaṅgāṃ ramyām* after *Rāghavaḥ;* but Beng. reads *tatra* for *Gaṅgām* in the first hemistich and *divyāṃ supuṇyām ṛṣisevitām* in the second and does not mention *Gaṅgām* till the last half of the next śloka:

pavitrasalilasparśāṃ himavacchailasambhavām
svargatoraṇaniḥśreṇīṃ Gaṅgām bhāgīrathīṃ nadīm,

the last hemistich appearing in NW as *svargarohaṇaniḥśrenīṃ maharṣigaṇasevitām.* Then Bomb. expands the description by adding some *kvacit* verses and, taking up the śloka which appears in Beng. with the two hemistichs *śiśumāraiç ca* and *haṅsasārasasaṅghaiś ca,* disposes one of them at 19a and the other at 25a, but with different forms of b in each, thus: Beng. *makaraiś ca niṣevitām* is represented by *bhujaṁgaiś ca samanvitām* and (*saṅghaiś ca*) *vāraṇaiś ca niṣevitām* by (*haṅsasārasasaṅghuṣṭām*) *cakravākopaśobhitām!* One sees it is an entirely different verbal text, by no possibility to be referred to divergent forms of an original, but

the same text substantially, treated in two ways as to expression, as contrasted, for example, with NW 4, *tām ūrmikalilāvartām anvavekṣya sa Rāghavaḥ* which is practically identical with Beng. *tām ūrmisalilāvartām anvavekṣya mahārathaḥ,* though even here there is still the improbability that one text varies from the other because of a copyist's error. Still, the two half-verses say virtually the same thing, and so with the next following:

NW: *Sumantram abravīt sūtam ihaivādya vasāmahe*
Beng.: *Sumantram abravīd Rāmo nivasāma ihādya vai*
Bomb.: *tām ūrmikalilāvartām anvavekṣya mahārathaḥ*
Sumantram abravīt sūtam ihaivādya vasāmahe.

Bomb. in a-b thus combines NW and Beng. and follows NW in c-d. In the following verses almost the same conditions hold, though Bomb. inserts 29, *prekṣāmi saritāṃ śreṣṭhām,* etc.; but NW in 7c has *rathād avātarat tasmāt* with Beng., as compared with Bomb. *rathād avatarat tasmāt,* where the Comm. says the verbal form is for *avātarat;* perhaps as more antique form, certainly not to avoid the three iambi, which are common enough. In the next śloka Bomb. and Beng. read *mocayitvā hayottamān* instead of NW's *snāpayitvā.* Then comes the introduction of Guha:

NW and Beng.:

tatra rājā Niṣādānāṃ Rāmasya dayitaḥ sakhā
dharmikaḥ satyasandhaś [Beng. *satyavādī*] *ca Guho nāma mahābalaḥ*

Bomb.:

tatra rājā Guho nāma Rāmasyā 'tmasamaḥ sakhā
Niṣādajātyo balavān Sthapatiś ce 'ti viśrutaḥ,

which gives Guha a new name. Bomb.'s *snehasaṃdarśanena ca* (41) appears in NW (18) and Beng. (18) as *snehād āghrāya mūrdhani,* but dissimilarly, where NW 20 has *na kālo me pratigrahe,* both Bomb. (44) and Beng. (20) have *na hi varte pratigrahe,* the latter the better reading, especially as NW adds an extra hemistich (*māṃ viddhi*) *caturdaśasamāḥ saumya vatsyantam pitur ājñayā,* which ought to give the hero time enough! In virtually the same passage the two texts thus agree here and differ there. Finally, Rāma accepts none of the offerings of Guha except

"fodder" (Bomb. *khādana*) or "corn" (NW and Beng. *yavasa*), *aśvānāṃ khādanenā 'ham arthī nā 'nyena kenacit* versus *aśvānāṃ yavasenārthī nā 'ham anyena kenacit*, two simple clauses that could scarcely have resulted from divergences of the same written original.

The shorter text, where a whole sarga appears in one recension and not in another, is presumably in most cases the older, because such sargas are obvious additions, that is, either inserted in maiorem gloriam of some person or thing to be revered or of decorative intent, and the same is true of casual differences where the slight praise of Rāma or Ganges or Viṣṇu of one text is amplified or exaggerated in another. It is highly improbable that amplification and exaggeration do not deserve these terms, that is that, had they been original, the other recension would have toned them down or pruned them of their edifying features. Texts NW and Beng. thus remain in general less antique than does the Bomb. recension. Apparently the NW recension is a variation of the Beng. text, with which it coincides more closely than with the Bomb. text, as may be seen toward the end of Ayodhyā, where the Bomb. text omits several sargas common to NW and Beng. Thus Bomb. has no sargas corresponding to NW 84 and 85, which are Beng. 80 and 81. Also NW 87 and 89 are the same as Beng. 83 and 85, and only a few verses (77, 1-3) represent them and the next sarga in Bomb. Moreover, if the Bomb. order followed that of NW, the sargas would be, consecutively, 78, 75, 81, 77, 76, 80, 82 (Bomb. 75 = NW 82-83). This NW order is that of Beng. to NW 97 = Beng. 93 (not in Bomb.); after which the three texts proceed together (NW 98 = Beng. 94 = Bomb. 86) till NW 102 (= Beng. 98) fails in Bomb. (Jacobi's *Concordanz der Bomb. und Gorres. Ausgaben* is at fault here; 93 should be 94). The subject-matter is the events after Daśaratha's death, where different bards have given free rein to their conception of what would be fitting, rather than follow a less ornate description.

But from the historical point of view we may take a wider sweep than is afforded by the Rāmāyaṇa texts. In the discussion of the unhappiness resulting from the lack of a king, all the texts have about the same material but this subject and its discussion are also treated in the Mahābhārata. The condition is not precisely the same, for the Mahābhārata text argues what would happen *yadi rājā na pālayet*, while the condition in the Rāmāyaṇa is implied

by the repeated shibboleth *nārājake janapade;* that is, one text is discussing the woes induced by a bad king who does not properly protect his people and the other the woes induced by not having any king at all. Yet in another chapter of the Mahābhārata this is led up to by a statement introduced by the broader condition *arājake jīvaloke,* 12, 49, 70, which is to all intent the Rāmāyaṇa condition in another form. Only the Mahābhārata suggests the improvement arising from having a king, but this is virtually the same verse as that of the Rām. without the negative:

Mbh. 12, 68, 32:

striyaś cā 'puruṣā mārgaṃ sarvālaṁkārabhūṣitāḥ
nirbhayāḥ pratipadyante yadi rakṣati bhūmipaḥ

Rām. Beng. 2, 69, 18:

nārājake janapade viśvastāḥ kulakanyakāḥ
alaṁkṛtā rājamārge krīḍanti viharanti ca.

In the preceding, the absence of sacrifices, feasts, and assemblies is emphasized; in Mbh. ib. 22, *yajñās, vivāhās, samājas;* in Rām., 12, 14, *yajñās, utsavās, samājas;* and the lack of Veda-reading:

Mbh. 26, *brāhmaṇāś caturo vedān nā 'dhīyīraṅs tapasvinaḥ*
Rām. 16, *vedān na 'dhīyate viprāḥ*

Here too there is no verbal similarity sufficient to imply that one text is a copy of the other, yet the ideas imparted are the same. In the Rām. the argument is given to induce the "king-makers" to appoint a king after Daśaratha's death; in the Mbh. it is to point out the necessity for having a guarding king. The three Rām. texts under consideration are evidently based on a common tradition differing as a whole from that of Mbh. The three texts begin with a list of sages who act as king-makers, practically the same list in all texts, except that NW and Beng. include Vasiṣṭha while Bomb. inserts Kātyāyana and omits Vasiṣṭha till verse 4, where Vasiṣṭha appears as the chief. These sages in NW and Beng. alike have the title *rājaguravas,* but in Bomb. they are called *rājakartāras.* They address Vasiṣṭha saying virtually the same thing in different words to the effect that the night is now over which has seemed like a century to them who have been grieving for king Daśaratha, who has died through grief for his son; as NW and Beng. have it:

śocatām putraśokena mṛtaṃ Daśarathaṃ nṛpam

or, in Bomb.,

asmin pañcatvam āpanne putraśokena pārthive

Both traditions keep the word *putraśokena* and express the rest each in its own way. Then begins the theme of *nārājake janapade* in which the texts vary little at first, e. g., Bomb. 10, c-d:

nārājake pituḥ putro bhāryā vā vartate vaśe

but NW and Beng. 9,

nārājake pituḥ putrāḥ samyak tiṣṭhante śāsane

and Bomb. 11,

arājake dhanaṃ nāsti nāsti bhāryā 'py arājake
idam atyāhitaṃ cā 'nyat kutaḥ satyam arājake.

Instead of *dhanam* here, the other texts emphasize *svam* and *parigrahaḥ* at this point and in so doing bring the Rām. version as a whole in close connection with the Mbh., thus:

R. N. W. 2, 73, 11:

svaṃ nāsty arājake rāṣṭre praśāntaś ca parigrahaḥ

Beng. 69, 11:

svaṃ nāsty arājake rāṣṭre pumsāṃ na ca parigrahaḥ

Mbh. 14-15:

hareyur balavanto 'pi durbalānām parigrahān
mame 'dam iti loke 'smin na bhavet samparigrahaḥ
na dārā na ca putraḥ syān na dhanaṃ na parigrahaḥ.

In Beng. *ib.* 27, *na . . svaṃ vai bhavati karhicit* seems to be a repetition, but NW 24 has here *svāsthyam,* while Bomb., which does not have the *parigrahaḥ* verse, has at 67, 31 *na . . svakam bhavati kasyacit.* The two epics are here playing the same tune but with variations much more pronounced than in the case of the different Rām. texts, though it is impossible to decide which of the three texts of Rām. represents the *ādi*-form.

The well-known śloka at Mbh. 12, 57, 41, copied from the "Rāma-carita," seems to be only another version of the above:

rājānaṃ prathamaṃ vindet tato bhāryāṃ tato dhanam
rājany asati lokasya kuto bhāryā kuto dhanam.

The first hemistich is found also at Mbh. 1, 160, 12, but without reference to the Rām. It is difficult to say whether the Mbh. agrees more closely with the NW Beng. or with the Bomb. text, though the insistence on *parigrahaḥ* in the former and in Mbh. as opposed to the Bomb. absence of the word would imply perhaps that in this place at least the Mbh. and NW Beng. text are more closely allied, contrary to Jacobi's general opinion that Bomb. agrees most closely with Mbh. (as e. g. above in Bomb. 11). While not prepared to dispute the further generalization that Mbh. has here borrowed from the Rām. and thus shows its later date, I would observe that the induction refers only to the pseudo-epical didactic twelfth book and to the later first book, so that the argument is not convincing as regards the priority of the great epic *quâ* epic but only as it now exists in its encyclopedic form. This applies not to the Rāma-story in Mbh. but only to the particular citation under question here, and yet in point of fact a somewhat similar objection to the above generalization may be made in the case of the *purā gīto śloko Vālmīkinā* (*na hantavyāḥ striya iti* etc.), in that the quotation appears in Mbh. 7, 143, 67, in an attempt to excuse Arjuna after Bhūriśravas' death. Professor Jacobi himself is careful to say only that the Rām. was known as an old work before the (whole) Mbh. *was completed* (*Das R.* p. 71). This (Droṇa) quotation was probably inserted midway in time between the creation of the Kuru epic and the addition of the *dharmaśāstra*. It would at any rate have been more convincing if Vālmīki had been cited by name in some part of the Mbh. not otherwise marked as late. Yet those who do not believe in the evolution of the epic will not be affected by this fact. But to proceed:

In Manu's Dharmaśāstra there is at 7, 20-21 what appears to be a popular saying: *yadi na praṇayed rājā daṇḍam . . śūle matsyān ivā 'pakṣyan durbalān balavattarāḥ, svāmyaṃ ca na syāt kasyacit.* Rām. Bomb. 67, 31, continues the text above with the words:

matsyā iva janā nityam bhakṣayanti parasparam

The Beng. text at 28 has *durbalān balavattarāḥ*

bhakṣayanti nirudvegā matsyān matsyā ivā 'lpakān (NW v. l.

kṣapayanti). Here Mbh. 12, 15, 30 (an entirely different section) has

jale matsyān ivā 'bhakṣyan durbalān balavattarāḥ

and at ib. 67, 16 repeats Manu 7, 20 (above). Compare also Mbh. 12, 49, 70:

arājake jīvaloke durbalā balavattaraiḥ
pīḍyante na hi vipreṣu prabhutvaṃ kasyacit tadā.

Obviously here is a proverb caught up by various authors and repeated in about the same language; it consists of a simile, "as big fishes devour little fishes" and is characterized by the phrase *durbalān balavattarāḥ* or its equivalent. But there is more here, namely a whole section of verses more or less closely connected (in Mbh. the verses are more diffused) on the same subject and in just about the same language. Besides the above, compare, for example, the following:

R. Bomb. 67, 18:

śerate vivṛtadvārāḥ kṛṣigorakṣajīvinaḥ

NW 73, 20 and Beng. 69, 20:

śerate vivṛtadvārā viśvastam akutobhayāḥ

Mbh. 12, 68, 30:

vivṛtya hi yathākāmaṃ gṛhadvārāṇi śerate . . . akutobhayāḥ (*akut.* also in śl. 25). Also:

Bomb. 29, *agopālā yathā gāvas tathā rāṣṭram arājakam*

Beng. 25, *agopāś ca yathā gāvas,* and note that here the reading of NW is not that of Beng. but of Bomb. and add Mbh. 12, 68, 13, *agopāḥ paśavo yathā.*

From this point, verses in Bomb. appear without exact parallelism in NW and Beng., while these two unite in verses comparable only with the Mbh. text. Thus Beng. 31 and NW 28 have

dasyavo 'pi na ca kṣemaṃ rāṣṭre vindanty arājake
dvāv ādadāte hy ekasya dvayoś ca bahavo dhanam

and Mbh. ib. 67, 14,

pāpā hy api tadā kṣemaṃ na labhante kadācana
ekasya hi dvāu harato dvayoś ca bahavo 'pare

and ib. 67, 2, *dasyavo 'bhibhavanty uta.* But again in NW 73, 27,

andhaṃ tama ive 'daṃ syān na prajñāyeta kiṃcana

and Mbh. 68, 10, *andhe tamasi majjeyur apaśyantaḥ parasparam,* there is a parallel to the evidently incorrect reading of Bomb. 36, *aho tama ive 'daṃ syān,* etc., a line completed in NW by *rājā cen na bhavel loke vibhajan sādhv asādhu vā* (v. l. *sādhu sadhu vā*), where both Bomb. and Beng. have *vibhajan sādhvasādhunī.*

We shall await the further fasciculi of this new edition with great eagerness. The editor has rendered a real service in publishing it. In some ways it is an unsightly text, disfigured with huge O and N against line after line, and it is a pity that the numerals, whether Sanskrit or Arabic, referring to notes, were not decided upon in advance; but there has been a steady progress toward clarity and the varied readings are abundant, if not quite so complete as desirable.

The induction which one is entitled to make from a study of the texts appears to be that the hope of getting at any *ādi*-Rāmayaṇa, by working back from the textual variations handed down in the several recensions, is quite vain. There can be no plausible original reconstructed and practically there was from the time of, let us say, the first repetition of the text, no original Rāmāyaṇa. From the very beginning there were variations in words and in arrangement of words; while added ślokas and even added sargas were so ingenuously yet ingeniously produced that only when the subject-mater smacks of religious excess can one reasonably argue that one text is more original than another. In the hands of manuscript copy-makers such a condition as now exists would have been almost impossible. The text must therefore, as Jacobi also believes, have been handed down by word of mouth and the bards who transmitted it were little concerned to reproduce exact tradition by the precise words or arrangement which they had heard. Sufficient to give the pregnant word as it lingered in memory, the scene as it traditionally occurred, perhaps beautified by the latest transmitter. At some vague period these oral versions were reduced to writing according to the local authorities and the written texts still hold the divagations of various ancient bards.

NOTES ON THE TOPOGRAPHY OF ANCIENT MESOPOTAMIA

W. F. ALBRIGHT
AMERICAN SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH, JERUSALEM

THE STUDY of the historical topography of Western Asia is being pursued with increasing interest and success of late. The control of Palestine, Syria and Mesopotamia by European powers opens these lands to scholarly investigation in a way formerly impossible, especially in Syria and parts of Mesopotamia. Thus it is now possible to set to work seriously on the badly needed archaeological survey of the lands included within the Mesopotamian sphere of cultural influence in antiquity. The geographical survey of this region is still far from complete, and only includes Palestine, parts of Syria, and about half of Mesopotamia, now being published by the 'Irâq government in separate sheets on the respectable scale of an inch to two miles (1: 126,720). In a few years, however, all these countries will have been thoroughly surveyed—even cadastrally in some cases—and the topographer will be freed from the necessity of following bad maps or of being his own cartographer. Only those who have tried their hand at this fascinating, but difficult task can appreciate the relief which this entails.

Now the principal task before the topographer is to collect materials for the required archaeological survey. Until this is finished, our identifications of sites, as well as our more general conclusions as to location of places and districts, must remain tentative. If we wish to identify the site of Mari, for instance, we must find a site which corresponds roughly to the indications of the texts as to location, we must satisfy ourselves that the extent and character of the ruins fill the requirements—and last, but highly important, we must make sure that the remains on the site date from periods in which we know that the city was occupied. In most sites in Western Asia belonging to the early period the only available criterion without extensive and costly excavation is the broken pottery which is strewn over the surface of the site. The comparative study of Western Asiatic pottery has now reached such a firm position that we may safely employ its results for topographic conclusions. To the *sine qua non* of topographic research, meticu-

lously accurate philology, we must add as a close second thorough and careful consideration of the pottery evidence.

For a number of years the present writer has been studying Palestinian topography on this principle, with ample justification in the results. It was not until the fall of 1925 that he was enabled to extend this branch of archaeological research to Mesopotamia, in collaboration with Professor R. P. Dougherty, who continued the work by making an independent archaeological survey of southwestern Babylonia (January, 1926). The results were most satisfactory, and the empirical knowledge of Mesopotamian pottery gathered from careful study of numerous mounds of all ages, especially where scarp sections had been cut in them by erosion, was again and again confirmed, and is in strict accord with the results attained already by Andrae, Hall, Frankfort, and others, though covering a much wider field. It is not our intention here to go into details; a preliminary account of our work in the Euphrates basin will be found in *Bulletins* nos. 21-2 of the American Schools of Oriental Research, and the fuller description will appear in the *Annual*.

Our primary purpose in this paper is to supplement and correct statements in the writer's article, "A Babylonian Geographical Treatise on Sargon of Akkad's Empire," in the JOURNAL, vol. XLV, 193-245. This paper was written before the writer's trip in the fall of 1925, and its conclusions were naturally in his mind during the entire journey. We may, accordingly, correct a good many erroneous statements, besides furnishing additional material for various contentions of ours. Some new publications have a direct bearing on the subject as well.

It is regrettable that certain observations in the paper have been taken as intended to disparage the work of Schroeder on this text, published in his *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts*, a perfect mine of material for all phases of Assyriology. This is very unfortunate, and is entirely wrong. "The text was copied so often or so carelessly in antiquity that it is very corrupt in places" (p. 193), but the modern editor is not to be blamed for the errors of ancient scribes. A great many supposed mistakes of the modern copyist must undoubtedly be ascribed to the ancient *dupšarru*, a state of affairs too often forgotten. In this instance the mistakes are in most cases so obviously those of the Assyrian scribe or scribes

that the writer called explicit attention to this fact repeatedly (pp. 193; 195, n. 1; 196; 197, 198; 219; 228 f.; 231; 234; 240; 242). Dr. Schroeder himself wrote that he could see no foundation for the rumor that had arisen. Lest this be insufficient, the writer wishes to stress the great admiration he has always had for Schroeder's work, which in accuracy and acumen is quite unsurpassed in the Assyriological field. Our text happens to be a particularly nasty one to handle, which is one of the reasons why it has not received adequate treatment before. Collations have been made by two or three German scholars, but since none have been published, we may take it for granted that no mistakes of the editor worth mentioning were found.

The treatment of the topography of the Middle Euphrates valley on pp. 199-208 requires some revision on the basis of the more recent researches of the writer. It was correctly noted that the Parthian Stations of Isidore all belong on the Arabian side of the Euphrates, as proved by Cumont's discovery that Dura Nicanoris is eṣ-Ṣâliḥîyeh. The result of this shift naturally is to distinguish entirely between this route and that of Tukultî-Ninurta II, which followed the Mesopotamian bank, without crossing the river. The Assyrian historiographer generally states clearly whether the town mentioned was actually visited, or lay opposite the Assyrian camp on the other side of the river. It therefore follows that Nagiâte, Aqarbâni, Ṣupru, Arbâte, Kaṣi were on the Mesopotamian, not the Arabian side. Scheil's attempt to identify the Merrhan of Isidore with Aqarbani-Naqarabani is entirely out of the question, since the towns were located on opposite sides of the Euphrates. In order to secure approximate locations for these places, we must start in the south with Ḫindânu. Owing to the distances given by Isidore between Giddan and Asicha on the one hand, Giddan and Anatho on the other, the writer felt compelled to suggest the identification of Ḫindânu-Giddan with Tell ej-Jābrîyeh below Albū-kemâl. Study of this region proved the correctness of this proposal; Tell ej-Jābrîyeh was occupied both during the Early Iron and during the Hellenistic periods, and is in every respect a remarkable site, which suits the literary indications for Ḫindânu-Giddan very well, as will be shown in the detailed study to appear in the *Annual*. It should be emphasized that this Tell ej-Jābrîyeh has nothing to do with the Jabarîyeh with which Miss Bell doubtfully identified

Giddan,[1] since the latter is some distance below it on the other side of the river. From opposite Ḫindânu to Nagiâte a road was hewn by Tukultî-Ninurta through Jebel Baghûz ("Irzi," the site of the tower tombs), so Nagiâte is probably Werdī (Werdîyeh), opposite Albū-kemâl, a little above. Aqarbâni must then lie north of Werdī, while Ṣupru is north of it. On the other hand Ṣupru is separated from the district of Sirqu = Tell 'Ašârah by Arbâte and Kaṣi, so cannot be placed too far north. Being separated on each side from the two fixed points, Ḫindânu and Sirqu, by two stations, we will naturally place it in the district between Tell eč-Ča'âbeh and Tell Abū'l-Ḥasan, either at one of the two, or at the two intervening sites, Tell el-Ma'âsreh and Tell Simbel. Tell eč-Ča'âbeh and Tell Simbel are exclusively Early Bronze (third millennium), though not important sites, while Tell el-Ma'âsreh seems to contain nothing but Early Iron, and has no earlier deposit. Tell Abū'l-Ḥasan is a fine mound, possessing both Early Bronze and Early Iron, as may be determined with certainty from the stratified mound scarp overlooking the river. Since Ṣupru existed both in the Early Bronze and in the Early Iron, the identification seems practically certain. It has nothing to do with Ṣâliḥîyeh-Dûrâ, as the writer rashly proclaimed in his previous article, misled by the vagueness of the itineraries. Aqarbâni presumably lay between Werdī and Tell Abū'l-Ḥasan, while Arbâte and Kaṣi were situated between the latter and 'Ašârah—just where can hardly be determined, since they may have been only villages of wattled huts.

The search for Mari, which was one of our principal objectives, was quite unsuccessful, and the mystery remains. The only possible location near the confluence of the Euphrates and the Ḫabûr seems to be Buseireh, ancient Circesium, but the writer was unable to find any traces of Early Copper strata underlying the thick deposits of the Graeco-Roman and Arabic periods. If it were not for the fact that the southern boundary of the district of Mari was at Ṣupru, which certainly cannot be placed farther south than Tell Abū'l-Ḥasan, it would be tempting to place Mari at Tell el-Ḥarîrī and Tell Madqûq (not *Madkûk*, as spelled in my previous article), north of Albu-kemal. Tell el-Ḥarîrī is a very extensive mound, half a mile across, while the adjoining Tell Madqûq is a striking

[1] *Amurath to Amurath*, pp. 111, 113.

cone several hundred meters to the west, and may be the ruined temple-tower of the city. Both were flourishing cities in the Early Copper age, and were abandoned about the beginning of the second millennium. There can be no doubt that Tell el-Ḥarîrī was at least as important as any city of the Middle Euphrates in the third millennium. From the confluence of the Euphrates and the Ḫabûr to the frontier of Babylonia there is no other early site that can compare with it. As pointed out in *Bulletin* no. 21, there is a strong temptation to identify Tell el-Ḥarîrī with Mari, which must have had precisely the same archaeological history. Nor should we overlook the important fact that the Merrhan of Isidore also lay in the vicinity of Tell el-Ḥarîrī and Tell Madqûq (middle of page 201), though, as we have seen, quite distinct from the Assyrian Aqarbâni-Naqarabâni, which was on the other side of the river. Since we are, accordingly, no longer swayed by Scheil's identification of Merrhan with Aqarbâni, we may consider Clay's identification of Mari-Mera with Merrhan more seriously. The final *n*, which Clay disregarded, may be due to an error of the scribe, whose eye wandered to the final *n* of the name Giddan, following Merrhan immediately on Isidore's list of Parthian stations. Merrha may have been a mere station with a caravansary attached, like others of Isidore's places, so we need not worry about its exact location. Both archaeologically and toponymically, then, we have excellent reasons for identifying Mari with Tell el-Ḥarîrī, but while the definite statement of the Schroeder text remains to vex us it is hard to escape from our dilemma. The alternative possibility that Tell el-Ḥarîrī represents the old Sumerian Aratta commends itself less and less, and the writer is inclined to doubt the correctness of the identification of Aratta with Sûḫi in Schroeder, no. 183.

We also failed to identify Rapiqu, though feeling confident that it is neither at Ramâdī nor at Šeiḫ Mas'ûd below Ramâdī. Tell er-Ra'yân we were unable to find with the time at our disposal, but it seems to be situated in the arid hills above the Euphrates Valley, so it is hardly likely that it is the site of Rapiqu.

Turning to the topography of the East Tigris country, discussed on pp. 208 ff., we must now surrender the identification of Zab(b)an with Altyn Köprü entirely. At Altyn Köprü there is no sign of an ancient mound, nor was the writer able to see any mounds in the neighborhood. Yet the arguments for a location of Zabban

on the Lower Zâb are just as impressive as they were. Without a full archaeological survey of the Lower Zâb valley, it would be unsafe to propose a definite identification. Working on the basis of the 'Irâq survey, the writer would call attention to Tell 'Alī and the extensive ruins of Gubab (Qubâb?) just above it. Tell 'Alī is just about a third as far from the mouth of the Lower Zâb as Altyn Köprü, and is on the direct line from Aššur to Arrapḫa (Kerkûk), with which it is still connected by road. The region south of Tell 'Alī has never been examined by archaeologists, but seems to contain numerous ruined towns and canals. We may safely identify it with Simurrum. The view that there was another town called Zabban or Zamban near Sippar, as maintained by Streck, Ungnad (*ZDMG* LXVII, 134, n. 9) and Meissner (*OLZ* 1919, 70, n. 1) is tempting, but does not follow with absolute certainty from the passages cited. Just where the Zabban of *Maqlû* I, 42 ff. belongs is quite obscure.

While Zabban is thus not at Altyn Köprü, there is no archaeological reason against the identification of Arrapḫa with Kerkûk, which is situated on an immense mound. In the neighborhood Professor Chiera, followed by Professor Dougherty and the writer, found numerous mounds, many of which date back to the earliest times, as is shown by the painted aeneolithic pottery with which they are covered. The same is true of the region south of Kerkûk, around Ṭâza Ḫurmâtu (Ḫurmatly) and below it on the Qâza Čai, which is lined on both sides with mounds. At Ṭâza itself there is a fairly large mound with Early Bronze pottery.

The problem of the location of Ašnunnak-Tupliaš has come into a new stage since Langdon's identification of Ašnunnak itself with Tell el-Asmar, east of the lower Diyâlah, a little over twenty miles in a straight line northeast of Baghdâd.[2] The reason for the identi-

[2] There is a serious discrepancy between the German and English war maps with respect to the situation of Tell el-Asmar. The English military survey sheet No. 2C Baghdād (scale 1: 253,440) places Tell el-Asmar nearly two miles southwest of the intersection of 44° 45′ E. long., 33° 30′ N. lat., while the German war map 1: 400,000, 5d. Baghdâd, places it eight miles northeast of the same point, or 31 miles (= 50 kilometres) from Baghdâd. The English detailed two-miles-to-an-inch survey for this section has not yet been published, so it is not likely that the English map is more correct than the German, especially since a question mark is placed after the name on the former. While the two principal cartographic

fication (see the discussion in *Kish I*) is that bricks mentioning the building of a temple at Ašnunnak are reported to have come from Tell el-Asmar. Langdon further suggests that Dêr was situated at Tell ed-Deir (Mound of the Monastery) south of Tell Asmar. The location of Ašnunnak west of Mendelī agrees quite well with the writer's location of it in the neighborhood of Mendelī (p. 217), though Tell el-Asmar seems rather far west. It may be that Langdon's informant was mistaken, or that the evidence of the bricks is not decisive. Dr. Legrain told the writer that bricks of Išmê-Dagan [3] precisely similar to those found by Langdon at Tell Baḥrîyah, which was identified with Isin on the basis of them, are also found at Ur.

The location of Dêr in the neighborhood of Tell el-Asmar cannot be made to agree with the indications of our geographical text. The identification of Dêr with Bedreh or a mound in its vicinity (Tell el-'Aqr?) seems more satisfactory, as seen by Forrer and others. Perhaps a still better solution would be the location of Dêr at Jessân, some twelve miles south of Bedreh. There are numerous mounds in the district of Jessân, which has the additional advantage of being nearer Babylonia, in which case Bedreh may represent Ibrat.

In connection with the modern Babylonian place-names discussed on pp. 219 ff., a few remarks are in place. Ancient Adab is now Bismâyah, not Bismîyeh. The two names are very common, and sometimes interchange. Umma is now Yôḫa, but *Yôḫa* is said by the natives to represent *Jôḫah*, since there is a marked tendency in 'Irâqī Arabic to pronounce *j* (*dj*) as *y*, as in *yâ* for *jâ'a*, *yemm* for *janb*. How the mound received its name, which means "piece

---

authorities differ by ten miles, it is very unwise to decide the question as to the identification of Tell el-Asmar with Ašnunnak on the basis of the maps.

[3] It is probably better to write *Dagan*, not *Dagān* with a long *â* in the second syllable, because the evidence for the original long *â* in the final syllable is very uncertain. The true Hebrew form of the name is *Dagán*, with two short *a*-vowels (דָּגָן), as we know from a comparison of the modern Arabic forms of the place-name *Bêt-Dagan*, now *Bêt-dâjan*, with the internal Hebrew-Phoenician evidence. The Masoretic Hebrew *Dagôn* is an erroneous Phonicianizing pronunciation; in Phoenician accented short *a* (Hebrew tonic *qameṣ*) became *ŏ* = *ω*, as in *Hadŏd* (Αδωδος) for *Hadăd*, etc.

of cloth" (*jôḫah*), I cannot imagine. The name of the canal Šaṭṭ el-Qâr is also peculiar, and there seems to be much uncertainty about its true form. Both the English and the German war maps spell it as though it were pronounced *Šaṭṭ el-Ḫâr* (Khar, resp. Char), which I have heard from Bedawîn at Nāṣirîyeh. The literary Arabic writing is, however, شط القار, *Šaṭṭ el-Qâr,* which, I was assured at 'Afeč, is the correct pronunciation. My native informants did not know the meaning of the name, which one is tempted to connect with literary Arabic *qârah,* plural *qâr,* etc., "mound, boulder" (*al-jubaïlu ṣ-ṣaġîru al-munqaṭi'u 'an al-jibâl,* etc.). A meaning like "Stream of Mounds" would be most appropriate for the old Euphrates of Sumer. The Šaṭṭ el-Qâr may, however, derive its name from the pre-Islamic canal Dû-Qâr, between Kûfah and Wâsiṭ (Yāqût-Wüstenfeld, IV, 10 f.). The name of the canal means, however, "Possessor of Bitumen," possibly because its quays were lined with asphalt.

The student of the early topography of Mesopotamia must not forget that nearly all the cities and towns outside of Babylonia which flourished during the fourth and third millennia (aeneolithic and Early Copper) were abandoned before the middle of the second millennium, so that their names rarely appear in later sources. This is in a measure true of Babylonia itself, where such cities as Šuruppak, Umma, Eridu, Lagaš, Ḫallab, Aratta(?), Badtibira, etc., existed only in the Sumerian and Early Babylonian periods, and were in ruins before the later Cossaean age. In the rest of Mesopotamia, however, it is a most striking fact to every archaeological explorer. As a result of the impressions gained from an examination of nearly a hundred sites in the Mesopotamian basin, including Northern Syria, which is inseparably connected with it, the writer believes that at least two-thirds of the unoccupied mounds of Mesopotamia outside of Babylonia were not occupied after the end of the Early Copper (Bronze). Probably half of the extant mounds of Babylonia proper were not occupied after this time. The most impressive region in this respect is the East Tigris country, where we found hardly any isolated mounds at all which had been occupied after the beginning of the second millennium. Our observation was restricted to the mounds which were directly accessible from the main road Baghdâd-Kerkûk-Erbîl-Môṣul. At a distance we saw scores of mounds in all direc-

tions, and passed through regions which were literally full of ruined canals. A study of the maps of the 'Irâq Survey is even more calculated to give an idea of the vast number of mounds in the East Tigris country. There is a reason for the great predominance of this region in the military and economic history of Early Babylonia. Following is a list of the sites visited during a motor trip from Baghdâd to Môṣul:—

— — —	Early Copper	Between Ba'qûbā and Šahrabân
— — —	E. C.	North of Kyzyl-robâṭ
(Diquqina)	Assyrian †	Ṭā'ûq
Ṭâza Tepe	Early Copper	Ṭâza Ḫurmâtu
Gôla Tepe	Aeneolithic, E.C.	Between Ṭâza and Kerkûk
Ḫazneh Tepe	" "	" " " "
(Arrapḫa?)	† Late pottery	Kerkûk
— — —	Early Copper	Between Kerkûk and Altyn Köprü
Gôr Tepe	† Assyrian etc.	" " " " "
(Arbela)	† Assyrian †	Erbîl
— — —	Only late seen	Between Erbîl and the Zâb
— — —	Early Copper	" " " " "
Tell Sa'dâwā	† Assyrian etc.	" " " " "
(Calah)	Assyrian	Nimrûd
(Nineveh)	(†?) Assyrian	Kuyunjik
(Dûr Šarrukîn)	Assyrian	Ḫorsabâd
— — —	Aeneolithic	South of Ḫorsabâd
— — —	"	" " "

In the above list we have employed the sign † to indicate the presence of strata of either earlier or later date, depending on whether it precedes or follows the main period given. Of the foregoing just half show no period of occupation later than the first part of the second millennium, while all but three seem to have been occupied in the early period as well as later. Until we reached Assyria Proper we found very few mounds which had been occupied during the Assyrian period.

The cuneiform records agree fully with the archaeological picture. As noted above, there is a very remarkable rôle played by the East Tigris country in the third millennium, where its cities and states appear again and again in our cuneiform sources, in striking contrast to the fewness of references to the West, Syria and the Upper

Euphrates country. The lands of the East Tigris region were then rich and prosperous, so that they acted as powerful intermediaries in the spread of Babylonian culture eastward into Persia and Turkestan. The Sumerian treasure of Astrabad,[4] southeast of the Caspian, loses its isolation entirely in the light of our growing knowledge of the early Sumerian culture of the East Tigris country.

Another example of the decline of civilization in Mesopotamia after the third millennium is the Balîḫ valley, below Ḫarrân. Of four large sites investigated in the valley of the Balîḫ only one was occupied after the beginning of the second millennium; not a single site was inhabited in the Assyrian age. Tell Zeidân is purely aeneolithic; Tell es-Semn is mostly of the same age, but was occupied briefly at the beginning of the Early Copper; while Tell el-Biyaʿ flourished only in the Early Copper, when it must have been a very important city, in view of its extent. Nicephorium (Raqqah el-ʿAṭîqah) was not founded until late in the Hellenistic age. The archaeological situation is illustrated by the total absence in Assyrian texts of references to organized civic life in the lower Balîḫ valley. In all probability it will turn out that Ḫarrân itself enjoyed its greatest prosperity during the earliest ages, though it may have escaped unscathed during the barbarian irruptions of the Dark Age.

The question of these barbarian invasions has been fully discussed by the writer in his paper, "The Historical Background of Genesis XIV" (*JSOR* X, 1926), so we need not repeat the arguments and conclusions here. Until the fundamental importance of these invasions is understood, the history of Western Asia must remain exceedingly puzzling. The irruption of the Balkan peoples into Western Asia in the thirteenth and twelfth centuries B. C. was insignificant in comparison; even the migration of the Cimmerians and Scythians, which brought about the downfall of Assyria and Babylonia, was more ephemeral in character, even if no less important in its consequences.

The wholesale destruction of Mesopotamian towns during the first part of the second millennium naturally makes it very difficult to identify places mentioned in texts of the third millennium. In a few cases the names survived as the designation of mounds, some

[4] See Rostovtzeff, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, vol. IV, pp. 4-27.

of which were later occupied again, as Barsip = Til-Barsip = Tell el-Aḥmar, Ḫubbu = Til Ḫumba (p. 227), etc. In general, however, the exact identifications must await the discovery of additional data, and especially the complete archaeological survey of Mesopotamia.

THE PROBLEM OF THE ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY OF THE DEITY NIN-IB (NIN-URTA, NIN-URASH)

GEORGE A. BARTON
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE DEITY Nin-IB, whose name is explained in syllabaries as Nin-ur-ṭa,[1] Ni-[ur]-ta,[2] and Nin-u-ra-as,[3] was one of the most popular deities in ancient Babylonia. Historically, however, he is one of the most elusive. The syllabaries identify him with many deities, and the religious literature ascribes to him many and varied functions. He is equated with Ningirsu, Ningishzida, Ninshakh, Dunpae, Lugalbanda, Zababa, Marduk, and Ashur, and a number of others. He is regarded as intercessor, protector, warrior, god of life, god of oracles, god of the chase, as sun-god, storm-god, weather-god, and as judge. He is son of Enlil, of Ea, of Ashur, and of other gods. He is consort of the goddesses Bau and Gula. He is identified with the sun, with Saturn, and with Venus. It is no wonder, then, that the opinions of scholars have differed widely as to his origin and functions, and even as to his name.

To mention but a few of these: I myself thought in 1902[4] that Nin-IB was simply a later name for the god Ningirsu of Lagash—a name by means of which that god was divested of local associations so that he might be worshipped in other cities. Jastrow thought[5] that Nin-IB was an epithet that was applied to many different deities. It was thus that he accounted for the ubiquity and the manifold character of the god. Clay, who discovered that in the Persian period in Aramaic his name was אנוישת,[6] held that Nin-IB was but one of the manifold forms assumed by the god Amurru,[7] who was for Clay one of the earliest, if not the earliest, of Semitic deities, and the original from which most historical Semitic deities sprung. Dhorme[8] regards Nin-urash as the origi-

[1] YBC, I, 53, 247.
[2] CT, XXIV, 18, 19.
[3] CT, XXV, 11, 25.
[4] *Semitic Origins*, 232.
[5] *Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*, I, 98, and II, 1088.
[6] BE, X, 8 f.
[7] YBC, I, 97 ff.
[8] *Hilprecht Anniversary Volume*, 369.

nal form of the name, derives *urash* from the root *erêšu* (غرس) "to plant,"—a qutl form—, and regards the god as a god of fertility, or an agricultural deity, the god of fields and canals. Ungnad,[9] on the other hand, thinks that Nin-urta was the oldest pronunciation of the name, that this was corrupted to Ni-urta, this to Ni-wushta, this to Iniwushta (אנוש), while from Ni-urta there was, he believes, also derived by a slight change, Nimurta, by which the deity was widely known. Such are a few of the wide divergencies of opinion.

One who works through the rich materials concerning Nin-IB collected by Jastrow in his great work *Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens,* or who looks up the literature on Nin-IB cited by Deimel in his *Pantheon Babylonicum,* 208 ff., can have no doubt as to the myriad forms assumed by Nin-IB in later thought, and of the great variety of functions and relationships ascribed to him. These are reflected in myths, in hymns, and in references in royal annals. None of the texts of this class come, however, from a time earlier than the First Babylonian Dynasty or the Dynasty of Larsa. If we would seek the origin of the god, we must push our knowledge back to an earlier date than this, for by the year 2000 B. C. two or three millennia of history had passed over Babylonia, city-state had many times conquered city-state, cult had mixed with cult, myth with myth. In a word there had been syncretism of all sorts, so that myths and ideas originally connected with one deity had been freely appropriated by others.

So far as I have observed, the name of Nin-IB does not occur in any hymn written earlier than the Dynasty of Larsa, and in but a few proper names. We turn accordingly to a study of these names. Ur-Nin-IB was the name borne by one of the kings of the Dynasty of Isin contemporary with the Dynasty of Larsa, but for the period of the Dynasty of Ur the proper names known to us of which Nin-IB formed the divine element were all borne by men of Drehem, a small city not far from Nippur and tributary to it. Among the tablets from Drehem there are records of lists of animals for sacrifice to Nin-IB together with similar lists to other deities. These texts range in date from the reign of Dungi to the end of the dynasty of Ur. The animals to be offered are usually lambs or sheep, though once, bullocks.[10] In these texts the deities

[9] OLZ, XX, (1917), 6 f. [10] Legrain, *Le temps des rois d'Ur,* no. 328.

are most often named in this order: Enlil, Ninlil (or Ninkhursag), Nusku, and Nin-IB,[11] though sometimes the god Utu (Shamash) and Ininni (Ishtar) are thrown in between.[12] Nusku and Nin-IB are similarly paired in tablets in which the names of the other deities do not occur.[13] The natural inference from the fact that the names are so arranged is that at this time Nin-IB was a goddess and was regarded as the wife of Nusku, just as Ninlil was the wife of Enlil and Ishtar the wife of Shamash. The writer years ago took the ground that all the Babylonian deities whose names begin with Nin were originally goddesses who later underwent a change of sex[14]—a view which a number of other scholars have shared. Radau has pointed out that Mash, who is equated with Nin-IB existed in both a masculine and feminine form[15]—a fact which confirms the theory. If the inference drawn from these Drehem tablets is justified, Nin-IB was at the time of the Dynasty of Ur still in the feminine stage of his development. Nusku was a fire god—perhaps a sun-god. The suggestion of Dhorme that Nin-IB (Nin-urash) was an agricultural deity, *urash* coming from *erešu* "to plant," appears to be well justified. Indeed the sign IB, by which the second part of the name is usually expressed, appears to bear out this meaning. The writer showed in 1920[16] that this sign originated in the picture of an enclosure, the second story, or the top, of which was reached by means of a staircase which ran up outside of it. Such a structure was built at Lagash by Ur-Nina and repaired by later rulers there, and its great staircase was discovered by de Sarzec.[17] Hall and Woolley have since uncovered a

[11] Cf. Legrain, *Le temps des rois d'Ur*, nos. 255, 256, 259, 269, 293, 295, 296, and Langdon, *Tablets from the Archives of Drehem*, no. 15.

[12] Cf. Legrain, *op. cit.*, no. 295. Once, (Legrain, no. 255), Utu appears without Ininni, though Enlil, Ninlil, Nusku, and Nin-IB occur.

[13] Cf. de Genouillac, *Tablettes de Drehem*, nos. 5501 and 5513. In a few of these lists the deities are not paired at all; thus CT, XXXII, pls. 42 and 43. The fact that in these Nin-IB is not associated with Nusku in no way weakens the argument advanced above.

[14] Cf. *Semitic Origins*, p. 192. A quarter of a century's advance in knowledge since this book was written places many of the problems which it treats in quite new perspective. The point in question is, however, confirmed by this advance. I hope at an early date to re-write the book.

[15] Cf. Radau in *Hilprecht Anniversary Volume*, p. 423 ff.

[16] *AJSL*, XXXVI, 315 ff.

[17] Cf. de Sarzec's *Découvertes en Chaldée*, de Sarzec and Heuzey's *Une ville royale chaldéenne*, and Cros's *Nouvelles fouilles de Telloh*.

similar structure at Tell Obeid four or five miles from Ur, that was built in the earliest period of Babylonian history.[18] Since the Babylonian sign for granary pictured a structure into the top of which grain could be poured and from the bottom of which it could be drawn[19] probably these structures were granaries. Such public storehouses were also temples so that the grain would be under the protection of a deity. There can be little doubt, therefore, that the sign pictured a granary, and was thus a fitting symbol by which to express the name of an agricultural goddess. As such structures have been found at two places among the earliest buildings of Babylonia, it is fair to assume that they existed in other places. Probably in the early settlements every town had one, so that Nin-IB, "the lady of the IB," was a generally recognized name for an agricultural goddess. That Nin-IB was an agricultural deity can scarcely be doubted. In later syllabaries he is identified with many agricultural gods, including *dka-lum-ma,* the date-god.[20]

All this being fairly well made out, what shall we make of the alternate explanation of the name Nin-IB, "Nin-urta"? Ungnad regards *urta* as the original form, and explains how *urash* may have been derived from it by phonetic change.[21] Such a supposition does not seem to be necessary; the two names may have arisen as separate epithets. We cannot prove, however, that Ungnad's view is wrong, and it may be right. If it be right, then Nin-*urta* was the earlier, if not the original name of the goddess, and our assumption that the goddess was an agricultural deity would require that the name *urta* should be appropriate to such a deity. In any case, *urta* needs to be explained.

It is noteworthy that in the Yale Syllabary this element of the name (*urta*) is spelled *urṭu,* with a ṭ. I venture to suggest that *urṭu* is a word for "earth" derived from the Arabic أرض. It

[18] See Hall in the *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries,* London, 1919-20, pp. 22-44; *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology,* VIII, 241 ff. and IX, 177 ff.; also Woolley in the *Museum Journal,* March, 1924, especially p. 9.

[19] See the writer's *Origin and Development of Babylonian Writing,* no. 487.

[20] CT, XXV, 11: 22.

[21] OLZ, XX, 6 f.

is true that ارض appears in Akkadian usually as *irṣitu* but the Babylonian Semites may have pronounced it ارض, whereas in Akkadian writing the nearest graphic representation of the ض possible was by a ṭ. It is possible, therefore, that *urta* may be but a slightly changed form of the oldest Semitic word for "earth." Nin-urtu would then be the "Lady of the earth," an appropiate name for an agricultural deity. In all parts of the world earth goddesses have been givers of agricultural products. However the name Nin-urtu may have originated, such we believe Nin-IB to have been.

As already noted, we find the worship of Nin-urta at Drehem as early as the reign of Dungi, fully a century earlier than we can trace it at any other place. This is shown not only by the lists of sacrifices already alluded to, but by the fact that the name of this deity entered as a component element into the composition of proper names borne by citizens of Drehem during the Ur dynasty at a time earlier than they have yet been found in any other part of Babylonia. At Drehem the individuals bearing the name were not numerous, but there were three during this period who bore the name: one was a scribe,[22] one a herdsman of cows,[23] and the third was a witness.[42] So far as our evidence goes, it would seem to point to Drehem as the original seat of the worship of Nin-IB, but in the present state of our knowledge this inference cannot be pressed. Were Nin-IB the original goddess of Drehem, one would expect more of its people to bear names compounded with hers. True, we have not as yet any very large number of tablets from Drehem, but it is also true that there are hundreds of mounds in Babylonia that have not been explored, and any one of these may reveal a form of the cult older than that of Drehem and one that commanded the allegiance of a much larger number of devotees.

Indeed from what we now know it seems possible that much additional information as to the early history of the cult of Nin-IB may be obtained when the ancient city of Dilbat is identified and excavated. Hammurabi, in the introduction to his code of laws,[25] says that he "extended the city of Dilbat and filled the granaries

[22] de Genouillac, *Tablettes de Drehem*, no. 5573.

[23] *Ibid.*, no. 5539.

[24] Nies, *Ur Dynasty Tablets*, no. 31.

[25] Col. iii, 16-24.

for the mighty god IB." Thus it appears that in Hammurabi's time IB was the god of Dilbat, though in the time of Nebuchadnezzar it was the seat of the worship of Anu.[26] From the order in which Hammurabi enumerates the cities of Babylonia, it seems that Dilbat lay to the south of Borsippa—an inference which is confirmed by many later references to it.[27] In Hammurabi's use of the divine name IB appears alone without the prefix Nin. If the simple and compound forms of the name refer to the same deity, IB is the simpler and earlier form, and the deity of Dilbat would be earlier than that of Drehem. Hammurabi's reference proves that IB was an agricultural deity, and his statement that IB possessed granaries (*karé*) proves that IB (*urta, urash*) was connected with the sign for storehouse as was inferred above. The name of the deity IB also occurs in some lists of gods found in the archives of the city of Ashur, in one of which it is equated with Bau and Ninlil,[28] and in another it is listed with Gula.[29] As IB is associated with storehouses and is equated with the same deities as Nin-IB it seems safe to assume that the two were but different forms of the same deity.[30]

When, then, we study the history of Nin-IB by a scientific method, it appears that we cannot trace the history of the cult back of the dynasty of Ur, that during the time of this dynasty our sources confine the cult to Drehem, and that during this period the deity was a goddess, the consort of Nusku—apparently an earth goddess. For the earlier history of Nin-IB we await the discovery of other sources.

---

[26] Cf. Langdon's *Neubabylonische Königinschriften*, pp. 72, 92, 108, 170, and 182.

[27] See the material collected by Hommel, *Geographie und Geschichte des alten Orients*, 396 ff.

[28] See Schröder, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts*, no. 154, 7.

[29] *Ibid.*, no. 42, col. iii.

[30] When this article was written, I had not noted the fact that a god IB is mentioned in tablets from Fara (Surippak) written in the fourth millennium B. C. (See Deimel *Wirtschafttexte aus Fara*, no. 6, rs. v, 7). This confirms the theory advanced above, and carries our knowledge of its beginnings back a thousand years earlier than the sources quoted in the article.

AN INSCRIPTION OF ELIBA'AL, KING OF BYBLOS

CHARLES C. TORREY
YALE UNIVERSITY

THE DISCOVERY of a third Phoenician inscription of earlier date than either the Moabite Stone or the Kalamu monument is especially welcome just now. By good fortune, the new find also comes from Byblos, thus giving us a better foothold for our study of Phoenician palaeography. We now have from this ancient city three royal inscriptions containing the same peculiar alphabetic forms: the epitaph of Aḥīrām, of the 13th century; the votive inscription of Abība'al, of the middle of the 10th century;[1] and the monument here discussed.

The new inscribed object is a small statue of the Egyptian king Osorkon I (924-895 B. C.), the son and successor of Šešonk I, which was placed as a votive offering in the sanctuary of Ba'alath Gebal at Byblos by Elība'al, king of that city. The monument is described, and the inscription deciphered and discussed, by Dussaud in *Syria,* VI (1925), 101-117. The monument was found by Wiedemann at Naples in 1881, and its hieroglyphic inscription was copied and published by him at that time. The Phoenician inscription was neglected, doubtless because it was not thought to be genuine. This statue, together with the fragment of another similar statue from the same sanctuary, was sold in Paris in 1910; and this time also the Phoenician inscription seems to have been regarded as a forgery, presumably because of the peculiar form of a few of the characters. It will be remembered that the Abība'al inscription, although it had been known for a quarter of a century previous to its decipherment, was suspected, or misread, until the discovery of the Aḥīrām sarcophagus furnished the key.

The inscription reads as follows:[2]

מ־ש | וסעל | אלבעל | מלך | גבל | ביח־־־ [ב]עלתגבל | אדתו |
תארך־־־[א]לבעל | ושנתו | עלי־־־

[1] For a discussion of these two inscriptions see this JOURNAL, **45**, 269-279.

[2] Dussaud publishes a photograph of the statue, but gives no facsimile of the inscription. Some of the characters can be seen only indistinctly, or not at all, in the photograph, and there is no definite statement as to the number of letters missing in the places where the writing has been obliterated.

The characters closely resemble those of the Aḥīrām and Abība'al inscriptions, and it is especially to be noted that we find here the same peculiar forms of the letters *kaf* and *mem*. The words are marked off by short perpendicular lines.

Dussaud renders as follows:

Cette statue a fait Eliba'al, roi de Gebal, en consé[cration à Ba]'alat-Gebal pour lui-même. Qu'elle prolonge [les jours d' E]liba'al et ses années (de règne) sur [Gebal!]

The first word of the inscription is taken by Dussaud to be the מאש "statue" which appears in a few neo-Punic inscriptions. This is certainly the natural interpretation if the reading is sure, though it is a disconcerting fact that we must pass over an interval of nearly nine centuries before we encounter the word again. Its origin is unknown, and there is no plausible Semitic etymology. Dussaud indicates a gap between the two letters, but does not state whether this is wide enough to give room for the letter א.

The sixth word, which is partially obliterated, is restored by Dussaud as [ב]יח[רם], the preposition with a *yif'il* infinitive which is rendered "consecration," with appeal to the Arabic احرام. Judging from the photograph, the break occurs at the end of a line, and in a manner which makes it uncertain how many letters are missing. The *yif'il* infinitive seems altogether likely, and the proposed restoration possible, though perhaps less probable. If the preposition ב is given the meaning "in return for," or "because of," it is possible to think of other verbs, such as חיה (or חוה) and especially the very common חנן. In either case the infinitive might be used with or without a suffix pronoun, though the latter construction would be more usual. Thus we might restore ב]עלתגבל[נו ביח (בִּיחָנוֹ according to Hebrew pointing),[3] "in return for the favor shown him by Ba'alath-Gebal." Any conjecture is precarious, however.

The next following word, אדתו, Dussaud explains as אוֹדוֹתָו, which he renders "à son profit." We know the Hebrew word, however, only in the combination על אודות "by reason of, because of," and the use of such a word here does not seem at all likely. It

[3] The same construction as in Gen. 4: 15, Josh. 14: 11, 2 Sam. 18: 29, Is. 5: 24; 20: 1, etc.

seems to me quite certain that the word is the feminine of אדון; he makes the offering to Ba'alath-Gebal, his divine *mistress,* the term corresponding to the רבת which appears later in the same combination. The form of the word is of course perfectly regular.

For the restoration of the remainder, לבעל [ים א] תארך (compare the phrase in the Yeḥaw-milk inscription, line 9), and the conclusion with גבל, would seem to be quite certain.

I would render the inscription as follows:

This statue was made by Elība'al, king of Gebal, in return for the favor shown him by his Lady Ba'alath-Gebal. May she prolong the days of Elība'al, and his years, over Gebal!

The palaeography of these earliest inscriptions from Byblos is interesting in more than one way. In the first place, it seems altogether probable, from the persistence, without change, of the peculiar forms of *kaf* and *mem* down to the ninth century, that these are merely local peculiarities, not archaisms (see this JOURNAL, **45**, 275). More interesting still is the fact that in the oldest inscription of all, the Aḥīrām epitaph, the style of the letters is not lapidary, but very distinctly suggests forms developed in writing on papyrus with a reed pen. We should expect this at Byblos, of all places in old Phoenicia. We are given the impression, too, of a literary language and a form of writing not at all new, but long in use. Because of the very close commercial relation of the Phoenician ports with the cities farther inland, it would be very strange if the same script and the same materials were not also in use at the same time in the interior of Syria and Palestine.

It now seems probable, not merely possible, that at the time of the Amarna correspondence (14th century) the usual mode of writing in all this part of Western Asia was with ink and the reed pen on papyrus or skin; using alphabetic characters whose form, to judge from the evidence which we have in the ninth century, varied only very slightly in the whole region reaching from Moab to the border of Cilicia. For diplomatic correspondence, and for business documents which it was important to preserve, often in duplicate, the clay tablet was incomparably better. The syllabic writing in the cuneiform character was also more precise and unambiguous for such documents, and under Babylonian influence its use had been familiar throughout Western Asia, including Asia Minor, doubtless

for many centuries. For all ordinary purposes, however, the North Semitic characters and the perishable materials must have been used. For how long a time, prior to the earliest inscription from Byblos, we have no basis even for conjecture. It is certain, at all events, that we are still a long way from finding the beginnings of the ' Phoenician ' alphabet.[4]

[4] The inscriptions of a peculiar type which have been discovered at various times in the Sinaitic peninsula, and recently have been much discussed (but not really deciphered), have thus far yielded no information of importance.

A SPECIMEN OF OLD ARAMAIC VERSE

CHARLES C. TORREY
YALE UNIVERSITY

WHAT WAS LOST to the world when the old Aramaic literature perished, we of course cannot guess. We have not at present, and probably never shall have, any satisfactory basis for an idea of either its volume or its variety. The Elephantine papyri brought a surprise in this regard, though perhaps not to those who were familiar with the Aramaic inscriptions.

In the important field of poetry, very little has thus far come to light. We know, indeed, that in the earlier Aramaic literature of the Jews it was customary to employ the standard line of three stressed syllables, as in Hebrew; the Book of Daniel furnishes sufficient illustration of this, though in only a few scattered passages.

I showed, some years ago, that in the Aramaic original of the Story of the Three Guardsmen, interpolated in the Book of Ezra, and now preserved in the fragment of the old Greek translation known to us as First Esdras, the three formal discourses of the contestants at the court of Darius are composed throughout in the familiar three-beat verse.[1] This very interesting tale may have had a Jewish author, but it is more probably Gentile in its origin.

The accentual verse is easily composed, almost too easily, in fact. Did the Aramaic-speaking Gentiles of the Persian period, or earlier, have also a syllabic meter, such as we have not found, for instance, among the Hebrews? Syllabic meter is the usual thing in the classical Syriac literature, but has not hitherto been surely recognized in the great western branch of Aramaic. I once demonstrated, in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* (Vol. 28, 1913, pp. 312-317) the possibility of Aramaic syllabic meter in the original form of the Lord's Prayer; showing that the Greek version given in the Third Gospel, if rendered verbally into Jewish Aramaic, can easily be made to represent strict seven-syllable verse. Several scholars, after reading the article, wrote me their approval. My own attitude toward my demonstration was, and is, one of benevolent skepticism. I was interested to show the possibility, but prefer to leave it to

[1] See *AJSL*, **23** (1907), 187; and *Ezra Studies*, 47.

others to recognize, if they will, something more than an instructive exercise.

There is, however, unquestionable syllabic meter, skilfully used, in early Aramaic. It is found in an inscription from Egypt which has long been known and studied. The monument bearing the inscription is in the museum of Carpentras, in Southern France. It came from Egypt, and is very characteristically Egyptian, but the place where it was found is no longer known. The inscription probably dates from the fifth century B. C.[2] The script, with approach to the 'square' character, and the language, with its Egyptian elements, are precisely those of the papyri from Elephantine.

The inscription is in four lines, with the closing portion of the last line obliterated. It is the epitaph of a woman, evidently a young woman; and is a noteworthy composition both for its human appeal and also for its literary merit. The most important feature, however, is the poetic form in which the epitaph is cast.

The presence of verse here has been suspected ever since the first decipherment of the inscription, and for reasons which are very apparent. Each one of the four equal lines of writing represents a logical unit; contains in fact a complete sentence, which we should mark off with a period. More than this, each line consists of two approximately equal clauses, so that the presence of a regular caesura is inevitably suggested. As the Aramaic is read, there is—at least in the major part of the inscription—a rhythmic swing which can hardly escape notice and from the first has impressed many readers. Finally, it is worthy of attention, in view of these facts, that in the carving of the first line of the inscription *a space was left* between the two clauses which make up the line; that is, at the supposed caesura of the hypothetical verse. This might indeed be accidental; but it is not customary to separate clauses by a space, and the coincidence with the other indications is very striking. It is easy to see that because of the unequal verbal length of the clauses in the following lines, and the limits

[2] I would refer to my discussion of the Aramaic palaeography of this period, in this JOURNAL, **35** (1917), 371, and in the *AJSL*, **34** (1918), 191 f. The closest parallels to our inscription are all of the fifth century, and there is no consideration which would tend to make a later date seem preferable.

of space on the inscribed surface, the graphic division, if intentional, could not well be carried through.

Joseph Derenbourg, in the *Journal Asiatique,* 6. série, t. 11 (1868), p. 277, was the first to attempt to show that the Carpentras epitaph is cast in metric form. His demonstration failed at certain points, but was in the main excellent, and in need of little improvement. A similar attempt made nearly ten years later by Schlottmann, in the *ZDMG,* **32** (1878), 188 (see also **33**, 252), was less fortunate, because less able, and did more harm than good. The belligerent Lagarde proceeded to 'show up' Schlottmann in characteristic fashion in the *Nachrichten der K. Ges. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen,* 1878, pp. 357-372, attacking his interpretation of the inscription, and among other things the theory of meter was held up to ridicule. Clermont Ganneau, in the *Revue Archéologique,* **37** (1879), 31-33, said in effect that he approved Lagarde's conclusions, but would himself have preferred to use more polite language. Both he and Halévy recognized a certain poetic form in the inscription, but rejected the theory of metric regularity. In *Palaeographical Society, Facsimiles of Manuscripts and Inscriptions,* Oriental Series, ed. William Wright, London, 1875-1883, the inscription (with Plate 64) was given excellent treatment in brief compass, chiefly on the basis of material furnished by Nöldeke. There was appended a transliteration of the first three lines in the form of verse, but with the comment, that the demonstration of meter for the whole inscription seemed impossible. The editors of the *CIS* also rejected the theory, and in recent years there has been no attempt to renew the discussion. In Cooke's *Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions* the commentary on the Carpentras Stele (pp. 205 f.) contains no allusion to anything of the nature of poetry in either outward form or inherent character of the epitaph; the reader would not know that the question had ever been raised; and the same is true of Lidzbarski's *Handbuch.*

The reason why the theory of an epitaph in verse has been so completely abandoned is probably to be found in the paramount influence of the *CIS.* The pronunciation of several of the words of the inscription is ambiguous, and on the decision here everything depends. The form of the Aramaic verb, in the feminine singular, is in unpointed text the same for the second and third persons: and it was natural to suppose that the direct address, which is

certain in the last two lines, was intended from the beginning. So the editors of the *Corpus* decide, and the subsequent treatises have accepted their judgment. With this understanding of the verbs in question, no theory of regular meter is possible. The current interpretation is certainly mistaken, however. In the first two lines of the epitaph the girl is spoken of, and characterized, in the third person; in the two remaining lines she is directly addressed.

The consonant text of the inscription reads as follows:

בריכה תבא ברת תחפי תמנחא זי אוסרי אלהא
מנדעם באיש לא עבדת וכרצי איש לא אמרת תמה
קדם אוסרי בריכה הוי מן קדם אוסרי מין קחי
הוי פלחה נמעתי ובין חסיה[י הוי שלמה]

Which I should render thus:

Blessed is Taba, daughter of Taḥapi, devotee of the god Osiris;
She, who to none did aught of evil, by whom no slander whatever was spoken.
Before Osiris be thou blest, before him take the gift of water;
Be thou (his) worshipper, my fair one, and among his saints be thou complete.

This is interesting as a religious document, and perhaps especially as an expression of human affection coupled with the conviction that the personal qualities which endeared this girl to her relatives and friends on earth will give her a favored place before the gods of the lower world. Taba, the fair one (and the attractive face pictured on the monument may well be an attempt at a portrait), she who had harmed no one by either word or deed, will stand near to Osiris as his handmaid.

There are several noteworthy parallels to this epitaph. One which comes especially close is a Greek inscription found in Palestine, at Nābulus, and reported to the French Academy in 1898. It is in two hexameter lines, the second of which has never been completely understood. It reads as follows:

θάρσει μοι συνόμαιμε καλή, ζάκορος γὰρ ὑπάρχεις
Κούρας Πλουτῆος, μυστήριον ης γὰρ Ἐλευσειν.

The extraordinary difficulty caused by this little inscription,

which at the first glance seems so easy of interpretation, can be seen by reading M. Philippe Berger's discussion of it (*Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Comtes Rendus,* **26** (1898), 50-54). The last clause of the second line has defied every attempt to give it a satisfactory rendering, "whether one takes ης as the relative pronoun or as the imperfect of the verb εἰμί." An interpretation to which Berger at one time inclined regarded Ἐλευσείν as an alternative form (already attested) of the geographical name, Eleusis, in the nominative case, and supposed the word μυστήριον to have here the (otherwise unexampled) meaning "tomb." That is, the inscription mentioned the consort of Pluto as "Koura (Korē), whose tomb was Eleusis" (in spite of the γὰρ!). Aside from the other improbabilities, this does not sound quite like an epitaph. A nearer approach to something plausible seemed to be made by regarding Ἐλευσείν as the name of the deceased person. It was suggested, with due hesitation, that μυστήριον might possibly have here the meaning of μύστης, "initiated." The rendering would then be: "For thou, Eleusin, wast initiated." This interpretation, however, met with little favor, for very obvious reasons.

The rendering finally adopted by Berger is one proposed by M. Théodore Reinach: "Tu étais en effet mystère, Éleusine." This, as he freely admits, is the expression of an idea which is rather French than Greek. Moreover, a feminine name Eleusin is not otherwise known; and with this rendering the γὰρ hardly comes to its rights. What is still more important, it is impossible to put out of sight the strong probability that this clause of the epitaph makes direct and definite mention of the Eleusinian mysteries, so closely connected with the hope of life after death. Every student of the inscription has felt this. M. Reinach himself had seen in Ἐλεύσειν (thus to be accented) the well-known contraction of the adjective form Ἐλεύσιον. That which seemed to him—and to all others—to prohibit the expected rendering was the little word ης. Nevertheless, the ultimate verdict of the great majority is doubtless expressed by Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes,* I, 651, note 13: "Die Verstorbene darf eines seligen Lebens im Jenseits gewiss sein, weil sie an den eleusinischen Mysterien theilgenommen hat (dies ist doch wohl der Sinn, wenn auch das Verb. ης Schwierigkeiten macht)."

If I am not mistaken, this problematic ης is merely a vulgar

analogue belonging to οἶδα, namely the second person singular of the 2nd pluperfect. On the basis of the much-used plural forms ἦσμεν, ἦστε, ἦσαν, the formation *in the popular speech* of a singular ἦς is perfectly natural. The occasional coinage of this form would be rendered still more easy by the analogy of 2nd plur. ἦστε, 2nd sing. ἦς (the common later form), from the verb εἰμί. How likely the use of οἶδα would be in this particular context may be seen, for example, in 1 Cor. 13:2, καὶ ἐὰν . . . . εἰδῶ τὰ μυστήρια πάντα, "even though I should *know all the mysteries.*" Render, accordingly:

Courage, fair sister! Sacred attendant now thou art
Of Korē, Pluto's wife; for thou knewest the mystery of Eleusis.

The Greek inscriptions also furnish parallels to the gift of water by Osiris. Thus, *CIG* 6562: Εὐψύχει, κυρία, καὶ δοί[η] σοι ὁ Ὄσιρις τὸ ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ. And similarly 6717: Δοίη σοι Ὄσιρις τὸ ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ. Still another inscription, presented to the French Academy July 25, 1879, has: Δῶκε ψυχρὸν Ὄσιρις ὕδωρ. This pious wish was a standing feature of the epitaph, it seems, even in the fifth century B. C.

To return now to the poetic form of the Carpentras inscription. The meter is syllabic, with only the full syllables counted, the reduced vowels being passed over, as in Syriac poetry. The verse contains fifteen syllables, seven in the first half and eight in the second half. There is unbroken alternation of accented and unaccented syllables, from beginning to end. The first half-verse begins with an accented syllable, and it is accordingly the second syllable of the second half-verse that is stressed. The epitaph, in transliteration, reads as follows:

Brīkā Tābā báth Ṭhapī tmonḥā zī Ōsīrī ʿlāhā
Mínda'ám b'īs lā ʿebdáth wkarṣē īš lā emráth tummā
Qdām Osīrī brīkā hwaí min qdām Ōsīrī mēn qaḥī
Hwaí pālēḥā nā"īmthī ūbēn ḥsayy[ōhī hwaí šalmā]

As was remarked above, the ending of the last line is obliterated. Lanci, one of the first to examine the stone carefully, thought that he could recognize traces of the characters לחיי שלם; and in subsequent editions of the inscription, including that in the *CIS*, it

has been customary to fill out the line in very nearly the manner shown here.

The *tummā* at the end of the second line is the feminine noun, "completeness," employed as adverbial accusative; a common and perfectly idiomatic construction with the negative *lā*, "not at all."—The pronunciation of the *feminine* imperative חוי is uncertain. It might well be *hwī;* the Syriac (artificial) vocalization *hwāi* is unlikely.—The word for "water" should perhaps be pronounced *mīn;* note the collocation *tīn we-mīn* in the Sardis Bilingual.—In company with the most of those who have discussed the inscription, I have supposed a stone-cutter's mistake in the last line; נמעתי should be נעמתי. I have vocalized the word according to the most common form of the Aramaic adjective. The preceding word, *pālēḥā* (instead of *pālḥā,* the reduced vowel being restored for the sake of the meter as in Hebrew and Syriac prosody), corresponds very well to the ζάκορος of the Nābulus epitaph.

It is true that this does not take us far in our knowledge of the poetic art of early Aramaic. There are technical details here which are, and presumably will remain, quite obscure. But the fact of strict meter is certain, and in our reading of the lines we undoubtedly can approximate the reading which would have been heard in the fifth century B. C. And in view of our very scant knowledge of the cultivated use of this great international language, the recognition of such a literary form as this is a matter of no slight importance.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Morgenländische Wörter im Deutschen. Von ENNO LITTMANN. Zweite vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage nebst einem Anhang über die amerikanischen Wörter. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. MOHR (PAUL SIEBECK), 1924. xii + 161 pp. Price, in paper covers, Goldmarks 3.50; bound, Goldmarks 5.00.

This treatise was originally composed for publication in a German army journal in Damascus, but while it was on its way in the mails the Turkish débacle took place. The chapter on Arabic words was then published in *Der Neue Orient* in September 1919, and the entire work was issued a little later as an independent volume. It now comes in its second edition, revised and enlarged.

The first group of borrowing includes those of ancient date, coming directly or through the classical languages, and these are the most interesting and in general the most familiar in actual use, although their origin is to the ordinary person the most obscure. Next the Hebrew words are treated, chiefly personal names (and derivatives), and slang, drawn from Yiddish. Third come the Arabic words, which are mainly in the field of Mohammedanism, science (mostly words beginning with al-, the Arabic article), astronomy, animal names, dress materials. Then come those from modern Persian, mostly through Turkish as intermediary. The words from other Asiatic languages—Indian, Tibetan, Malay, Chinese, Japanese, Australian—have entered German chiefly through English. Last comes a chapter on African words, and an appendix on words taken from the languages of the American Indians.

Many of the items are very interesting: for example, the account of *Lazarett* (p. 41), *Tächtelmächtel* (56), *Getto* (59; which he shows to be not from an oriental source, but from Italian), *Muselmann* (61-62), *Askari* (68), x = unknown quantity (77). He even calls attention to the fact that the schooner in which Lieutenant von Mücke performed his Odyssey after the loss of the Emden bore the name *Ayesha,* the English spelling of Mohammed's favorite wife; this touch was doubtless intended to interest the German soldiers in Syria and Palestine.

Although Professor Littmann professes not to include words which are not reasonably familiar to the ordinary person, he has certainly listed a great many which are not in general use. His index shows nearly 1100 entries, a fair number of them being derivatives of other words which appear in the list, but I defy any but the best educated German to define over 80 to 90 per cent. of them.

In such a number of etymologies, there are not a few which may be called into question. In some instances Professor Littmann himself mentions their disputed quality, in others he does not. The reviewer does not think that the *Elemente* (Latin *elementum,* plural *-ta*) owe their name (p. 8) to a form of the alphabet in which *l-m-n* were recited first (v. Walde, *Lat. etym. Wtb.*,[2] s. v.), nor would he attribute even doubtfully (p. 11) the Greek βασιλεύς to a Semitic source (v. Boisacq, *Dict. étym. de la langue grecque,* s. v.). Still the book is a valuable monograph, even though it is intentionally not fortified by references to sources, except some given in the preface (VIII-XII), and it is well calculated to rouse in the German mind an interest in those Eastern lands in which Germany has now a smaller influence than of yore.

ROLAND G. KENT.

University of Pennsylvania.

Introduction à l'étude critique du nom propre grec. By C. AUTRAN. Paris: Librairie orientaliste PAUL GEUTHNER. First three fascicules, of 80 pages each. Price, 20 francs per fascicule [1925].

The author takes as his text the interpretation of the name *Polyneices* in Euripides' *Phoenissae,* 636-7, and demonstrates that this name cannot have been identical in origin with the adjective πολυνεικής 'very quarrelsome,' a very ill-omened name. It must therefore originate from a pre-Greek population which spoke a different language. For all Greece, and in fact all the Mediterranean lands, had a pre-Indo-European population which has left traces in the names of men (and places). Further, the personal names which are not readily interpretable as Greek increase as we go backward, and are most numerous in Homer: what is the

significance of the names of *Ajax, Teucer, Agamemnon, Odysseus, Tydeus,* etc.? So we must seek their origins in the "Pelasgian" language and in its congeners. There are many correspondences between Greek names and those found in the Lycaonian inscriptions, for example. Greece certainly changed its language between 1900-1200 B. C. and the classical period. Even many Greek names easily interpreted as Greek are known by tradition to be the names of non-Greeks: *Thoas,* the 'swift' by Greek etymology, was in reality an old king of Pelasgian Lemnos, and no Greek at all. Greeks and Trojans in Homer bear the same names, which are therefore not Greek.

Thus we cannot tell just what names are Greek and what are not; we are not warranted in translating as Greek those whose names make a Greek impression. Two explanations of the Greek-seeming names of non-Greek heroes have been given: (1) that the names were borne by persons whom the Greeks thought of as Greeks, (2) that the Asianic names have been translated into Greek. But neither theory is fair, for many of the names are interpreted as referring to events in their adult life or in that of their children; cf. the name *Phlegyas,* interpreted from the punishment of his son Ixion, forever whirled on a fiery wheel. But we are not privileged to accept part of the tradition about personal names as historically true and to reject the rest: the tradition is too uniform and coherent. So if *Polyneices* did not have a Greek name, neither did his brother Eteocles, although *Eteocles* also is apparently made of good Greek elements. *Oedipus* also, the father of these two, has a non-Greek name, and so has their sister *Antigone.* If *Polyneices* does not have πολυ- 'much, many' as first element, then other names in *Poly-* probably have not. What is the significance of Πολύανδρος 'Lebeaucouphomme?' (Easily interpreted, the reviewer thinks, as a bahuvrihi compound, 'having many men [as his followers].') In the same way, as W. Schulze, *Lat. Eigennamen,* has shown, the Latinity of many Roman names is a thin veneer over an Etruscan basis. (Why not in some instances real Roman names disguised in Etruscan use and orthography?) It is unreasonable to find the religious name *Apollodorus* 'don d'Apollon' and the profane name *Polydoros.* So non-Greek gods are probably lurking in many "Greek" names, quite unrecognized, since the divine names have as such disappeared with

the loss of the language of their worshipers. It must be remembered that in the writing of many languages there are serious inconsistencies and imperfections, preventing proper representations of the spoken sounds, and resulting in variations of the graphic representation of the same word.

This is the substance of M. Autran's first chapter, entitled "Le Paradoxe du Nom propre grec," pp. 1-71. Hereupon begins the second chapter, "Coup d'oeil préliminaire sur l'Ensemble de l'Onomastique géographique gréco-latine balkano-hellénique," which he prefaces by stating that he will list many, but not all, the geographical names of Greece, with the evidence as to their affinities; he puts aside all search for the meaning of the names, as apart from his purpose, and is not concerned with any Indo-Europeanizing system, but considers them from the historical, literary, and critical standpoints only: for most of these pre-Greek languages are unknown except for a few words. With page 80, he begins his list of names, in tabular form extending across the two pages facing each other: in column 1, "noms faisant l'objet de la liste"; column 2, "données notables traditionelles, archéologiques, économiques ou religieuses"; column 3, "homologues locaux en Asie Mineure"; column 4, "homologues locaux en Italie-Etrurie"; column 5, "homologues locaux dans le reste du monde ancien." Page 240 (the end of the third fascicule) arrives only at Ἠλέκτρα.

M. Autran is writing in controversion of Fick-Bechtel, *Griechische Personennamen*,[2] and does show, we must admit, that at least a goodly number of names regarded as Greek are probably not Greek at all, but from pre-Greek and non-Greek languages. But he goes too far. It is not unheard-of to rename an individual according to some event of his life, as is still done among the Arabs; cf. the name of the first of the Mohammedan caliphs, *Abd-el-Ka'ba* 'servant of the temple,' who gave his virgin daughter Ayesha in marriage to Mohammed, and thereby got the name *Abu-Bekr* 'father of the virgin,' by which he is historically known. This practice is probably of very ancient origin; a trace of it seems to appear in Odysseus' conditional imprecation on himself in *Iliad* 2. 260, "may I no longer be called the *father of Telemachus*, if I do not. . . ." Further, one should not deny the probability of translating names from one language into another; I have personally known of a Herr *Hoch* who became Mr. *High* and of a

Mademoiselle *Boeuf* who transformed her name to Mademoiselle *Bos*. The most likely instance of this in Homer is the doublet name *Paris* and *Alexander*. On the other hand, names may be corrupted by popular etymology from a foreign language into one that seems native to the language normal in the land; Herr *Süssholz* becomes Mr. Seasholes, and his son does not disabuse his Franco-Belgian professor who thinks that at last he has a pupil with a good Anglo-Saxon family name. But the significant name may be created by renaming in the fashion already mentioned; or even the story may develop first, and precede the naming of the character, who is created for his place in the story. We cannot really accept all the personages and names as original in the story; and the additions—any student of the mythology will know how details and additional characters are freely added by the poets—will be of Greek nature, with Greek names attached to the added personages. *Polydorus,* for example, is a minor character in the Trojan story, but was sent to Thrace when Trojan fortunes declined, with many treasures of the royal family; who can doubt that his name was constructed to agree with this feature of the legend? We need not demand that the members of a family shall have names which are either all Greek or all non-Greek; some may be Greek and some non-Greek; I know a family where three sons are named John, Charles, George—Hebrew, Germanic, Greek. M. Autran has pushed even the argument against ill-omened names too far; while the feeling against such names was stronger in antiquity than now, we may recall the fairly recent death of a titled German whose name was Pförtner von der Hölle, and I have met a young Spaniard whose family name was Maldonado.

So I am inclined to think that the true Greek quality in Greek names is rather larger that M. Autran will admit; yet there is no doubt that his work, which promises to be truly monumental in scope, will place the study of Greek names on an entirely new basis, showing a large intermixture of non-Greek elements in their fabric.

ROLAND G. KENT.

University of Pennsylvania.

Ancient India: from the earliest times to the Guptas, with notes on the architecture and sculpture of the mediaeval period. By C. DE B. CODRINGTON. With a prefatory essay on Indian sculpture by WILLIAM ROTHENSTEIN. London: ERNEST BENN, 1926. Large folio, pp. xv, 65 cuts and 76 plates.

Professor Rothenstein's preface provides an adequate "appreciation" of Indian art. It is impossible even for archaeology to dispense with aesthetic understanding; too many Indian archaeologists have in this respect been a generation behind the times. What Mr. Dalton has recently remarked with reference to Byzantine archaeology (*East Christian Art,* p. 22) may be applied exactly to Indian, substituting "Indian" for "Christian": "The principles governing this Christian art have received their due; that which the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries refused to consider has been regarded with favouring eyes. Thus aid has come from another side to those who have striven to combat the erroneous view that Early Christian art was nothing more than classical art in decadence. The very features for which Hellenistic art was once praised are now condemned as its worst. . . . In no other field of research have archaeology and criticism better helped each other to overcome ungenerous tradition."

With regard to Mr. Rothenstein's citation of my own views, I wish to say that I am far from ascribing any particular spirituality to Indian artists as such; I have made it sufficiently clear in the Preface to my Introduction to Indian Art, that all Indian 'artists' were essentially craftsmen, and not men of genius exploiting a peculiar temperament, nor in any sense peculiar. In Indian culture, as Keyserling has rightly pointed out, greater emphasis is laid on training than on 'inspiration.'

Mr. Codrington himself deplores the stress that has been laid upon the difference between Indian and Western Art: Yukio Yashiro does the same in his recent great work on Botticelli. The fact is that Indian art does not differ in principle from mediaeval Christian art, though it may well be called more profound; both corresponded to and proceeded from a general necessity, and both had real uses. But both differ in principle from the personal 'fine art' of the present day, an art that serves but a fraction of the population; and if we mean by Western art the art of the

present day, then the distinction between this and Indian art, which existed for practical purposes, can hardly be over-stressed.

Professor Rothenstein speaks of the "return of Brahmanism," as though it had ever disappeared, perpetuating the old fallacy of a "Buddhist India" and a "Brahmanical renaissance." The worship of Vāsudeva flourished in the second century B. C.; every coin of Kadphises II bears the image of Śiva; and the very richness and complexity of Gupta Brāhmanism, literary and artistic, is evidence for the previous continuous activity.

Mr. Codrington's book, so far as it goes (this is the first of three volumes) may well be described as the best account of Indian art that has yet been published; it will be indispensable to every student, both as an introduction to the subject and as a work of reference. The treatment is moderately full, sufficiently documented, and adequately illustrated, though we do not understand the author's difficulty in obtaining photographs of the Mathurā school. Major omissions, among which may be mentioned the Dīdarganj figure, the very important Guḍimallam liṅgam, and the Gupta temple at Bhumara, are comparatively few.

The supposed foreign elements in Mauryan, Śuṅga and Kuṣāna art are judiciously discussed. With regard to the former it is pointed out, as has also been done by Diez in a recent important book, *Die Kunst Indiens,* that the Indian bell capitals are not by any means identical with the Persepolitan forms. In brief, there are common elements in the arts of ancient India and Persia, but they seem to be due to common sources. The motifs common to Mesopotamian, old Persian, and Indian art may be described as cognates rather than as loans; and this consideration is supported by the recent discoveries of Indo-Sumerian culture in Sind, all tending to the thesis of a common Early Asiatic art of which Persia and India were equally inheritors. In discussing the originality of early Indian art some reference might well have been made to the views of Strzygowski, Berstl, Dimand regarding the designs, and of Beylié and Rivoira in regard to the architecture. Dalton (*East Christian Art,* p. 166) points out that the technical methods (vertical projection and inverted perspective) used at Bharhut and Amarāvatī are of interest because they appear in countries farther west at a rather later period; this kind of art, moreover, was certainly the first to attain mastery in the representation of crowds.

As for Gandhāra, "a complete restatement of the facts of Gandhāran art is necessary." The work of Foucher is a "mountain of theory, intricately worked out," but resting entirely upon the chronology adopted, which "whole chronology does not contain a single fixed point or undebateable landmark." "In default of definite evidence, one cannot believe that purely Indian conceptions of such personal and religious importance could be evolved by such a poor and unacclimatised school. . . . The Buddha figure appears in Kushan art so naively and simply; and its stylistic development is so clear that there is no reason to antedate Gandhāran sculpture in order to provide a borrowed origin for it." When however (p. 51) the author states that "certain Mathurā stone tablets portray the sitting Buddha; they have been dated epigraphically as early as the first century B. C.", documented evidence should be supplied: one suspects that Jaina figures may be referred to and as is pointed out elsewhere (p. 46, note) the early dating given to these by Bühler means nothing more than pre-Kuṣāna in terms of the chronologies now adopted. On the other hand the author is right in saying that the influence of Gandhāran style is only traceable in the middle period of Kuṣāna art and even there is slight and transient.

In discussing the stylistic continuity between Kuṣāna and Gupta art (pp. 42, 45, 47), ill-accounted for by "the dateless and murky gulf that at present stretches between Kushan and Gupta times," and in referring to Cunningham's antedating of the Guptas, mention might well have been made of the Mysore A. S. Report for 1923, where evidence is brought forward tending to put back the dates of the Guptas by a hundred years.

We are told in the Preface that the transliteration of names has been simplified as much as possible, the rendering of the chief authority being adhered to; and that Mr. C. H. Rylands of Cambridge has looked over the proofs from this point of view. The result can scarcely be admired. The only diacritics employed are ś, and ā, ē, ī, ū; and these are distributed with a capriciousness that could hardly be surpassed. Examples can be found on every page; we may cite Amarāvati, Ajanta, Visvakarma, Rameśvara, Kśatriya, Parasurāmeśvara, Adināth, Sakas, Sungas, Suparsva, Asoka. As regards the actual spellings, it would be interesting to know the 'chief authority' for Sahri-Bhalol, and Garwha (= Garhwā).

Quite apart from these caprices of transcription is the extreme carelessness of the proof-reading. This is especially noticeable in the Catalogue of the Plates. Thus the description of Plate II A begins "Figure of a woman," and presently goes on "This vase had a spout": the fact is that a large part of the description of Plate III has been placed under that of Plate II. Under Plate XI, figures F and D are referred to as figures E and F. Under Plate XXXIX, figures B, C and A are referred to as A, B, and C. No special knowledge on the part of a professional proof-reader exercising quite ordinary care would have been needed to detect these errors, which reflect no credit on the publishers. Risely (= Risley), Kohn (= Cohn) Vahārī (= Varāhī), Kanishika, Hinen Tsang, lotos (side by side with lotus), Markuwar (elsewhere Mankuwar, Mankuwār), Ghandakutī, Sythic, Yumuna, chouri, cope-stone (= coping-stone), Uākātaka, Pallauas, Vaishuara, etc., might perhaps be excused as oversights or misprints; but a full list of corrigenda would occupy something like two pages of the folio volume, and this is altogether too much. It is to be deplored that an original and important work such as this, sumptuously designed, and well printed and illustrated, should have been issued in such an unfinished state. The volume is of rather unmanageable dimensions, which hardly seems to have been necessary, as the full size of the page is made use of for single illustrations in the case of only thirteen out of seventy-six plates.

ANANDA COOMARASWAMY.

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

Asoka. By D. R. BHANDARKAR, Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture. Calcutta: UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA; 1925. xviii + 346 pp.[1]

This book embodies the Carmichael Lectures of 1923. Nearly all of it is occupied with historical matters, but an account of the Asokan inscriptions is given as well as translations of these. The style is rather more ornate than is considered in good taste; and an identification of the Asuras with the Assyrians (p. 215) will

[1] Review printed with permission of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Inst.

not meet with European approval. The bibliography in general is excellent, but the writings of Lüders (in *SPAW*, 1913 and 1914) are not given, nor have they been utilized except twice, with the result that the translations of the inscriptions could be bettered in some instances. There are a few other references which have been overlooked, but not many.

The weakest points in the book are those dealing with purely linguistic matters. So there is no attempt to justify the correspondence of *Peteṇika* (so!) and *Pettanika* (of the *Aṅguttara-Nikāya*) on pp. 32, 33, though such an equation defies known phonetic shifts. My old derivation of *Peteṇika* from * *Paitrayaṇika* (*IF* 24. 52 ff.) is the only one thus far offered that is phonetically impeccable. The derivation of *āsinava* (pp. 126, 127, 307) from *āsnava* (*a* + *snu*) is due to Burnouf, as I pointed out nearly eighteen years ago (*IF* 23. 268), which Bhandarkar overlooks. Bühler merely pointed out that the Jainas had a term (*aṇhaya*) which has the same derivation. Any attempt to equate *āsinava* with *āsrava* (*ā* + *sru*) meets fatal obstacles in known phonetic laws. I do not think the Buddhist term *ādīnava* (p. 129) a mistake for *āsinava*. As long as we have Shāhbāzgarhi *praṣaṃḍa* beside *praṣaḍa* (B's *prashaḍa*, p. 172), may not the latter be a mere graphic variant of the former? Terminally *ṃ* is often omitted and also before medial consonants. Then we would not have to equate *praṣaḍa* with Sanskrit *pārṣada*, which is phonetically awkward, unless we assume that the lingual *ḍ* of *praṣaḍa* is due to the analogy of *praṣaṃḍa* (Sanskrit *pāṣaṇḍa*, for earlier * *pārṣaṇḍa*).

On p. 193 ff. there is a brief discussion of the Asokan dialects. That the various Asokan dialects are not all in the same stage phonetically but are nevertheless contemporaneous, is perfectly true; but this is not news (see Michelson, *JAOS* 33. 145-149). On the other hand it is obvious that the Asokan dialects presuppose dialects in the Sanskrit phonetic stage; and here a time element enters. Incidentally I remark that we do not have *kaṭa* "invariably" in Kālsī: it is highly probable that the isolated *kiṭa* represents the local dialect and that *kaṭa* is merely a Māgadhism. Nor does *edisa* occur in the Girnār redaction. Nor do I see any necessity for denying the lateness of Prākritic forms in Vedic texts. The whole argument regarding the interrelation of Sanskrit and the Asokan dialects is unconvincing. What value is the testimony

of Bharata unless his date is known? How long Sanskrit was spoken by cultured persons naturally and without any study of grammar is unknown. That it may have survived till near the Christian era is possible in view of Patañjali's well-known statement. But it is clear that it had ceased to be a true vernacular, spoken by the masses, for some centuries B. C., yet in the present state of knowledge it is impossible to fix a precise date.

The use of the term "Pāli" in the sense of non-Sanskrit Indo-Aryan vernaculars is unfortunate, though Bhandarkar is not the first to do so. It should be restricted to its pristine sense. It may be admitted for once and all that our knowledge of the vernaculars from *circa* 200 B. C. to 450 A. D. is most inadequate. When the dialects upon which the literary Prākrits are based were spoken as true vernaculars is unknown. A lower limit is set by the languages of the fragments of the Buddhistic dramas published by Lüders. That the so-called Gāthā dialect was ever spoken by *śiṣṭa* or any other people, I cannot bring myself to believe. The use of "Pāli" in the sense of "monumental Prākrit," to which usage I have taken exception (*JAOS* 31. 235), would lead one not conversant with Indo-Aryan philology to think that this was the same as the Pāli of the southern Buddhistic writings (see *JAOS* 31. 236). This is not the case. As I have shown in my paper on the linguistic affinities of Ardhamāgadhī Prākrit (*AJP* 41. 265 ff.) we must admit that there were a number of early Middle Indic dialects which did not coincide with any of the Asokan dialects. Some of these are presupposed by the literary Prākrits; for others there is direct evidence.

On p. 272 Bhandarkar lists most of my papers on the Asokan dialects, but overlooks those published in *JAOS*, 1909 and 1916, but I cannot complain as I have been treated worse in the recently published Index-number of *JAOS*.

The translation of *ā Taṃbapaṃṇī* (in the 2d of the Fourteen Rock Edicts, Girnār redaction) by "as far as the Tāmraparṇi" is one of the mistakes alluded to above, due to Bhandarkar's ignorance of Lüders' papers. As shown by Lüders, *ā* corresponds to Sanskrit *yā*. Syntactical considerations force this; and the phonology is impeccable (cf. *IF* 23. 236). In this connection it may be observed that the notes on the translations are ordinarily very full, so that even the publication of the new edition of *C. I. I.*

will not render this part of Bhandarkar's work superfluous; and it cannot be denied that occasionally he has made real contributions in the interpretation (*e. g.,* the sense of *samāja*).

The translation of the last sentence of the 3d of the Fourteen Rock Edicts is difficult; but Lüders has, I think, solved the crux; and if so, the translation given needs revision. As to *prādēsikē* in the same edict, see now Hultzsch, *C. I. I.,* vol. I, p. 5. Bhandarkar scores in his version of the opening lines of the 4th edict; and shows that the innovations of S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar are untenable. The 5th edict is difficult. Bhandarkar rightly takes *bhatamaya* (*bhaṭamaya*) as the equivalent of Sanskrit *bhṛtamaya,* following Bühler. The other proposed etymologies defy known phonetic laws. Hultzsch's return to *bhṛta-m-ārya* is to be regretted. The translation of the end of this edict is certainly wrong, while that of Lüders is correct. On *Peteṇika* see above. The explanation of *parigodha* given by Thomas violates the phonetic laws of both the Girnār and Shāhbāzgarhi dialects. As to *baṃdhanabadhasa,* I think both Bhandarkar and Hultzsch are right as opposed to Bühler. The reference by Hultzsch to the Delhi-Tōprā pillar-edict IV is especially convincing. The author correctly combats the views of Senart and Bühler regarding the word *vaca* in the 6th Rock-Edict; and shows the weakness of Jayaswal's solution. I confess I do not know any explanation that both satisfies phonetic laws and gives a meaning suitable to the context. The explanation of *vinīta* given by Basak is adopted by Bhandarkar, no doubt correctly, who further elaborates Basak's argument. As regards *nijhatī,* Lüders' interpretation is convincing; wherefore Bhandarkar's translation needs correction. Jayaswal's translation of *parisā* is correctly adopted. The last clause of the 7th Edict contains the old crux *nicā,* the solution of which is again given by Lüders. Long ago Bühler saw that this did not correspond to Sanskrit *nityam:* see *JAOS* 31. 239, 240. The attempt to justify *nicā* as a nominative plural by Bhandarkar by appealing to R. E. V, where a breach of concordance occurs in the Girnār redaction, fails, because, as I have shown in *AJP* 32. 441, *kāsati* is in all probability a corruption due to *kāsati* of the next sentence, an explanation which Hultzsch accepts. The interpretation of *ayāya saṃbodhiṃ* in the 8th R. E. is the one given by the author in 1913 and is acceptable. To expect * *tadopariyā*

in Dhauli and Jaugaḍā, if *tadopayā* stands for *tadauparyāt,* is not correct: we should expect *tadopaliyā.*[2]

The translation of *tamhi tamhi pakaraṇe* in the 9th edict by "in various things" should more likely be rendered "on such and such an occasion" (Hultzsch). Though Bhandarkar has good company in rendering *savaṃ paricajitpā* in the 10th edict by "renouncing everything," yet I think that Fleet and Hultzsch are closer to the mark by rendering it "laying aside every (other aim)." The point that Asoka "nowhere advocates absolute poverty," should be borne in mind. For *dīghāya* read *dighāya.* The 11th edict is one of the easiest; no comments are called for except to call attention to the misprint on the first line of page 298. The translation of *samavāyo* in the 12th edict by "concourse" as opposed to "concord" (Hultzsch) seems correct in view of the next phrase which implies hearing; and so *susuṃsera* is rendered properly "desire to hear." For *vachoguti* and *bhatitā* on the first line of p. 300 read *vachaguti* and *bhatiyā* respectively. Incidentally I add that Hultzsch's recent explanation of Girnār *vaciguṭī* is more probable than my old explanation. An entirely satisfactory explanation of the officials known as *vacabhūmikā* is still lacking from the point of view of phonetics. The translation of the 13th edict clearly needs revision in the light of Lüders' early work and Hultzsch's more recent translation and comments. Attention may be called to the fact that Girnār *sarasake* is not the representative of Sanskrit *śara-śakyaḥ* but is a bahuvrīhi of *sva* + *rasa* as shown by the Shāhbāzgarhi correspondent. Kālsī *ṣayakaṣi* is then an adjective formation to *svayam.* The supposed *etānaṃ* is really *e tānam.* The new readings show the Pulindas must be eliminated from the list of peoples. Years ago I pointed out that Girnār *P*[*i*]*riṃdesu* might nearly as well be read *Pāriṃdesu,* which the new edition in fact reads (see *AJP* 31. 63). The agreement of the Kālsī and Shāhbāzgarhi correspondents in the vocalism is decisive. On Shāhbāzgarhi *Pitinikeṣu* see my note above on Girnār *Peteṇika.* The translation of Girnār *dhaṃmavāyo* depends upon whether or not *dhramaśilana* is the correct reading of the Shāhbāzgarhi redaction. The translation of the last sentence in the 14th edict is not satisfactory. Neither is the recent one of Hultzsch: for though, as

[2] See Hultzsch, *C. I. I.*, p. 15, footnote 5.

the latter points out, Girnār *sachāya* (*sachhāya*) corresponds to Sanskrit *saṃkśāya*, this forces us to emend *saṃkheye* of the Kālsī version which corresponds to Sanskrit *saṃkhyēyam* (save the termination). Any attempt to derive Girnār from *saṃkhyāya* or from *saṃkhyēyam* is phonetically improbable.

We come next to the Pillar Edicts. In the 1st edict it is impossible to derive *saṃpaṭipādaye* from *sampratipādyam*. Nor can it come from *-daka-*. The correct solution was given by Franke long ago: see *WZKM.* 15. 403, and Wackernagel, *AiGr.* II[1], § 179. Bhandarkar is unaware that Bühler gave up the derivation of *gevayā* from *gēpya-, glēpya-*. But Bühler's later derivation from *gēvaka-* is also phonetically untenable: see *IF.* 23. 264, 265. Although a certain solution is not offered, I think it at least plausible that * *gēvaya-*, a formation like *pādaya-*, is the source. That *āsinava* can come from *ā* + *sru*, as maintained in the notes to the 2d edict, is phonetically impossible (see above). In the 3d edict the derivation of *no mina* from *no manāk* (following Bühler) is phonetically impossible as I pointed out long ago (*IF.* 23. 236 237), nor has Hultzsch's recent return to the old view convinced me: his appeal to the change of *a to i* in Prākrit, citing Pischel, is useless in view of the vocalism of the first syllable of the Pāli and Prākrit correspondents to *manāk:* observe Pāli *manā, manaṃ*, Prākrit *maṇā, maṇaṃ;* note further Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī *maṇāgaṃ, maṇayaṃ, maṇiyam* (Hemacandra); Apabhraṃśa *maṇāū* = * *manākam*. Though Bhandarkar accepts my derivation of *mana* (or, at least, presumably: he does not quote me accurately), the division of *iyaṃmana* into *iyaṃm* and *ana*, as recently proposed by Hultzsch, is probably correct; and if so, the interpretation of the passage is rather different from that given by Bhandarkar. In the 4th edict it is more natural to construe *me* in the second line as a genitive singular rather than as an instrumental singular, granting that *me* as an instrumental singular occurs undeniably in the Māgadhan dialects. On the whole I think that *dhaṃmayutena* is to be taken as the name of some officials. It is not likely that the translation of *chaṃdaṃnāni* as a dvandva compound and the syntactical construction which this implies will meet approval. For its rendition as a tatpuruṣa yields perfectly good sense and involves no straining of grammar. Nor is it necessary to assume that *kāla* in the Rūpnath Minor Rock Edict is declined as a feminine. It may be noted

that the difficult *abhītā asvatha saṃtaṃ* and its correspondents in the other versions are not touched upon. The new edition of *C. I. I.*, vol. I, does not remove the phonetic difficulties in the way of Lüders' interpretation, which, however, is accepted by Hultzsch. As long as Lüders is cited twice on p. 313, it is to be regretted that his interpretation of *nāsaṃtaṃ* is not reported as is that of Senart and Bühler. I still am unconvinced that Lüders is right, even though Hultzsch has accepted his interpretation (see *JAOS* 36. 205). As is known, the 5th edict is difficult mainly on account of the list of animals made inviolable. For a long time to come opinions will vary on the interpretation of these. Naturally *palasate* corresponds to (Pāli) *parasato* rather than *palāsādo*. In the 6th edict Bhandarkar adopts Deb's derivation of *pāpovā, pāpova*. Unfortunately, the latter's linguistic arguments against the derivation from *prāpnuyāt* (or **prāpnōyāt*) and in favor of derivation from *prāpūryāt* fail; for the fact that at Dhauli, Jaugaḍa, and Kālsī we have *pāpun-* corresponding to Sanskrit *prāpnōti* (cf. Girnār *prāpuṇati*, Shāhbāzgarhi *prapunati*, both of which point to **prāpṇōti*; cf. V. B. *tṛpṇōti* but Classical Sanskrit *tṛpnōti*; the other Asokan dialects are not decisive) is not pertinent as the dialects are not the same; and observe at Rūpnāth, Brahmagiri, and Śiddāpura we have *pāpotave*, which points also to Sanskrit *prāpnōti*. Furthermore Prākrit lends its support: note Amg. *pappoi*, JŚ. *pappodi*, though other forms are more common. In the 7th edict Bhandarkar adheres to his old conjecture *vyūthā*. I can make nothing out on line 22 of the new facsimile between *ānapitāni* and *pi* though Hultzsch reads [*ya*] . . . [*is*]*ā* and hence restores *yathā pulisā*, which, in spite of Bhandarkar, makes perfectly good sense. Bhandarkar follows Fleet in the interpretation of *aḍha-* as "eight," as does Hultzsch. Nevertheless in view of *aṭha-* "eight" which is certain in Kālsī and Rumminidēī and possible elsewhere, as well as *aṭhamī-* and *aṭhami-* in the Pillar Edicts, I cannot subscribe to such a view. Note especially *aḍha-* in the sense of Sanskrit *ardha-* which is certain elsewhere. The *ḍh* for *ṭh* would be without parallel unless Hultzsch's derivation of *niṃsi*[*ḍha*]*ya* from * *niśliṣṭakā* holds true, and the phonology involved in this is not impeccable. Furthermore Bühler read *niṃsiḍhiyā*, though his etymology also is not beyond reproach. The phrase *etadathā me* in line 24 is not commented upon. My division of this into *etad*

athā me and interpretation of it (*athā* = Sanskrit *yathā,* the phonetics of which are impeccable) was accepted by Lüders but is now rejected by Hultzsch. The latter connects *athā* with Girnār *athā* (dative, for ordinary *athāya*). This fails because there is no dative singular of *a* stems in *-āya* in the Pillar Edicts to match it as there is in Girnār: *-āye* is the termination. Further we regularly have *aṭha-* corresponding to Sanskrit *artha-,* dative *aṭhāye.* It is true that Hultzsch reads *a*[*th*]*āye* in line 31. The brackets indicate the uncertainty, and if correct could not be considered anything but an error. But Bühler read *aṭhāye.* The translation of *tuṭhāyatanāni* (so!) in its strict etymological sense may be correct.

We come now to the "Separate" Edicts. In line 4 of edict 1 of Dhauli (cf. line 2 of Jaugaḍa) Bhandarkar follows the usual translation of *sumunisānaṃ,* but, as Hultzsch observes, Lüders' division of this into *su munisānaṃ* is surely correct (*su* = Sanskrit *svit*). The correct translation of lines 8, 9 of the Dhauli version and 4, 5 of the Jaugaḍa redaction (in the corresponding passage) is due to Lüders and Hultzsch, wherefore Bhandarkar's translation needs revision. And there are one or two other cruces in this edict which Hultzsch has just cleared up. The translation of the 2d edict suffers decidedly from not utilizing Lüders' work, but to point out the necessary corrections would take up too much space. To come now to the Minor Rock Edicts, the translation of the Brahmagiri edict surely needs correction in line 2 of the inscription. Obviously *ekaṃ savacharaṃ* ends a sentence, and does not begin one. Nor can I accept Bhandarkar's interpretation of *vyūthena 200 50 6,* but as long as full bibliographic references are given any one can look them up and decide for himself. The Sahasrām inscription is also much abbreviated in the beginning. I regret not finding any of the translation acceptable save that of the last sentence. Thomas must be given full credit for clearing up the meaning of the difficult passage involving "256." The first portion of the Rūpnāth inscription is untranslated, nor can the translation of the latter portion be regarded with favor. The translation of the second half of the Brahmagiri inscription presents no difficulties in general interpretation. I should punctuate the original rather differently than Bhandarkar's translation implies. No translations are given of the Śiddāpura and the Jaṭiṅga-

Rāmēśvara inscriptions, presumably because of their fragmentary state. The same applies to the Bairāṭ inscription, as well as to the Maski one. As to the Bhabru (Calcutta Bairāṭ) inscription there is little preference to be given to the version of Bhandarkar or that of Hultzsch.

In connection with the Minor Pillar Edicts, the interpretation of *silā-vigaḍa-bhīcā* on the Rumminidēī inscription as standing for *śilāvikaṭa-bhittāni* defies phonetic laws. Charpentier's explanation is the best thus far offered; but even so needs further proof before it can be definitely accepted. On the whole I prefer Hultzsch's new interpretation of *dutiyaṃ* on the Nigliva inscription to the customary one which is followed by Bhandarkar. The Sārnāth inscription offers no real difficulties; opinions may vary slightly on minor matters. The interpretation of the Sanchi inscription will naturally depend upon whether the readings of Bühler and Boyer or those of Hultzsch are to be preferred. The new facsimile in *C. I. I.* vol. I supports Hultzsch. For this reason I think Bhandarkar's version needs correction. The translation of the remaining inscriptions calls for no comment, save that that of the 3d Barābar Hill cave-inscription clearly calls for amplification and the sense given by Hultsch in *C. I. I.* vol. I.

There is a point upon which I should like to comment which is not linguistic. Caesar and Asoka are compared, to the great disadvantage of the former. His affair with Cleopatra brands him as "a gross elderly sensualist." Now Asoka had at least two wives and more than one harem. Is full justice done Caesar?

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D. C.

Asoka Text and Glossary. By ALFRED C. WOOLNER, M. A. Oxford: UNIVERSITY PRESS (American Branch: New York), 1924. Part I: xxxvii + 52 pp; Part II: iv + 156 pp.

These two volumes are intended as a handbook for the study of the early secondary Indo-Aryan languages, and as such succeed admirably. A handsome tribute is paid to the late Dr. Laddu, and a full acknowledgement is made of the use of Dr. Laddu's

literary remains. By good fortune it was possible to incorporate the more important variants in Hultzsch's new edition of the Asokan inscriptions in the text or footnotes, and all in the glossary. First we have an introduction which tells us about the inscriptions and then a section on their decipherment and interpretation. An outline of the grammar follows; and then we have the texts. So much for Part I. Part II contains the glossary. It may be noted that where there is room for debate practically all authorities are cited impartially.

Obviously a detailed review of these modest volumes is uncalled for. Still a few remarks may be made. On p. xx of Part I it would have been fitting to have mentioned the works of Konow and Johansson, to say nothing of those of the pioneers in things Asokan. On p. xxi the opinion of Lüders on the eastern dialect as being Old Ardhamāgadhī is given. That this cannot be sustained is proved by me in *AJP* 41. 181-183. On p. xxii Woolner overlooks my work in *JAOS,* 1909. The derivation of *tamhi* and *tasi* from *tasmin* on p. xxvi is impossible; they both come from *tasmi:* see *JAOS,* 1911, 232. Incidentally the term "Old Indian" should be replaced; it is simply a translation of the German equivalent. On p. xxxvi *nāsaṃtaṃ* is given the force of Lüders' interpretation, against which see *JAOS,* 36, 205. As long as the variants of the new edition of *C. I. I.* are mostly given, it is not especially important if they are adopted or not. But it should be pointed out that in some cases, at least, the entire import of the passage is changed. However, these volumes are clearly "school-books" and succeed admirably as such; and the generous citations in the glossary more than make up for the trifling deficiences which I have pointed out.

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D. C.

The Folklore of Bombay. By R. E. ENTHOVEN. C. I. E. New York: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, AMERICAN BRANCH, 1924. $4.70. Pp. 353.

Only those who have endeavored to collect folk beliefs from the folk itself can appreciate the magnitude of the work presented here

by Mr. Enthoven. Obviously, it is not possible for one person to gather so much information by himself, especially if that person is a European, a stranger, and therefore *a priori* an object of suspicion. Mr. Enthoven, like his predecessors, Sir James Campbell and Mr. A. M. T. Jackson, on whose work he has built, has made use of much native assistance. The results justify the time and money expended. In this volume is crowded an unbelievable amount of folk belief and folk practise, stated in the briefest and most unadorned form, covering the worship of natural objects, of animals (including snakes and the semi-divine Nags), of ancestors and holy men, the practise of totemism, customs connected with belief in the evil eye, with spirit possession, with dreams, with disease, with agricultural rites, with women's rites, and with a few other, miscellaneous, subjects. The chapter headings are not always inclusive, as is bound to be the case: for example, agricultural superstitions and practises appear throughout the book, and the 24 pages specifically devoted to them do not exhaust the material presented.

In general, the work is a bare recital of beliefs and practises with scarcely any attempt at interpretation. In as far as he theorizes Mr. Enthoven accepts the conclusions of Sir James Campbell that spirits are in origin ancestors and that spirit scaring and spirit housing are earlier and later forms of primitive practise. He goes further than Campbell, however, in seeking additional sources for primitive beliefs. But clearly the chief value of the book lies in presenting folklore material from regions hitherto unexplored, particularly the Deccan and the Kanarese country; so that this new investigation coupled with what had been done before gives us a complete report on the Bombay Presidency, excluding Sind.

There are respects in which the work might have been amplified with profit. For example, more attention might have been given to Mohammedan folklore, and some examination might have been made of the folklore of the Indian Christians in the Salsette, who have curiously combined the Hindu with the Christian, as derived from the Portuguese. But to make an issue of these points would be ungrateful in the presence of so much other material.

Typographically the book could be bettered. Sanskrit words appear without diacritical marks and sometimes with wrong

spelling. Worst is the inadequacy of the index. It fails to list many subjects that should be noted, nor is it exhaustive in the case of many of the subjects that appear. To use the book one must read it through. This is a great misfortune; for it means that a large amount of the best material is almost inaccessible for the general student of primitive religion.

W. NORMAN BROWN.

University of Pennsylvania.

Poems by Indian Women. Selected and rendered by various translators, and edited by MARGARET MACNICOL. (The Heritage of India Series.) OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS (American Branch, New York.) 1923. 99 pp. 85c.

It is not the custom in these pages to treat of works that aim to stimulate aesthetic appreciation rather than to advance knowledge; yet the mention of such works might occasionally not be amiss. Most scholars are lovers of art as well as of science.

Mrs. Macnicol's selection extends from the somewhat austere hymn, Rig Veda X. 39, ascribed to Ghoshā, and the Pāli lays of the Buddhist sisters, into the *bhakti* poetry of medieval India, passionately religious, and the sensuous verses of the Mogul period, down to the stanzas of Toru Dutt and Mrs. Sarojini Naidu.

I quote a couple of short selections as samples: the first is by Lal Ded, a Kashmirī poetess:

> With a rope of untwisted thread am I towing a boat upon the ocean.
> Where will my God hear? Will He carry even me over?
> Like water in goblets of unbaked clay do I slowly waste away.
> My soul is in a dizzy whirl. Fain would I reach my home.

The other is by the Empress Nur Jahan, wife of Jahangir:

> The crescent of Id has at last appeared in the face of the heavens.
> The key of the wine-shop had been lost, and at last it has been found.
> My eyes have no other work but to shed tears—Yes, what other work can people without hands and feet do?

The translators make no claim to equal the original, and possibly they do not; but the imagery remains beautiful and the emotion brings response.

W. NORMAN BROWN.

University of Pennsylvania.

Der Jainismus. Eine indische Erlösungsreligion. Nach den Quellen dargestellt von HELMUTH v. GLASENAPP. Mit 3 farbigen und 28 schwarzen Tafeln. [Kultur und Weltanschauung. Eine Sammlung von Einzeldarstellungen. Herausgegeben von Helmuth v. Glasenapp. Erster Band.] Berlin: ALF HÄGER VERLAG, 1925.

As the number of books for the Western study of Jainism is still very limited, this comprehensive account of the subject is very welcome. It includes history, literature and inscriptions, doctrine, ethics, mythology and hagiography, social organization, including sects of the present day, ritual, and the relation of Jainism to other religions, both Indian and non-Indian.

The most striking feature of Prof. v. Glasenapp's arrangement of material is his treatment of the categories, which belong traditionally, as a unit, to the sphere of Metaphysics. The author, to be sure, enumerates them as division I of Metaphysics, but their discussion is divided and placed under different titles, which more or less obscure the categories as such. Categories one (soul) and two (non-soul) are treated as a sub-division of a division of Metaphysics; three (merit) and four (demerit)—Śvetāmbara numbering—, five (channels by which karma may enter), six (ways of impeding karma), eight (ways of destroying karma), and nine (mokṣa) are treated under Ethics, but again divided. Three and four, with five merged into them, are discussed together as subdivision 1 of Practical Ethics; subdivision 2 discusses the Vows; and categories six and eight occupy subdivisions 3 and 4 of Practical Ethics. Category nine is made division III of Ethics. I do not find the seventh category (bondage) treated separately. It seems to be fused with the account of karma (p. 165).

The advantage of this departure from the traditional method of treating the categories is not apparent. They certainly are metaphysical, in ordinary terminology. If they have a direct bearing on ethics, so does karma; yet karma is retained under metaphysics. But, whether labeled Metaphysics or Ethics, the categories should be treated as a unit. They are, as they are named (tattvas), the fundamental principles of Jainism, and as such should stand out with the utmost clearness. Jain schematics has its advantages.

In a work of this sort that covers so many aspects of its subject,

it is obviously impossible for each section to be exhaustive, and many details must be omitted. But the important divisions of karma, nikācita and śithila (Stevenson, Heart of Jainism, p. 185), should not have been omitted. References to these divisions of karma turn up in the Jain texts, but they have been strangely ignored by the reference books. In the biographical sketch of Hemacandra (p. 49 f.), "the most important author whom the Śvetāmbaras have produced," mention might have been made of the autobiographical material now available in the praśasti to the Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra, which Bühler did not know.

The sections on Gessellschaft and Kultus contain much material not easily available, especially in regard to the modern sects and customs of both the Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras. But, again, one could wish that more space had been given to the differences that separate the two sects. Most of them certainly seem trivial, but they are of interest as they have produced an animosity between the two sects out of all proportion to the divergence of belief.

The discussion on Welthistorie and Hagiographie also contains interesting new material. Brief biographies of all the Tīrthaṅkaras have appeared elsewhere, but this, I believe, is the first account in an European language of the Vāsudevas, Balas, Prativāsudevas, and Cakravartins.

The introduction contains a survey of the past and present study of Jainism. The bibliography is very extensive. It contains three divisions: works in Indian languages, translations, and publications in European languages. For a good bibliography one is always grateful. Yet, while sources are listed here and additional ones given in the notes—which would be more convenient to use if placed in foot-notes, instead of the back of the volume,—specific references to sources are sometimes omitted when they would be desirable. For instance, the statement is made (p. 24) that Mahāvīra apparently belonged to Pārśvanātha's order at the beginning of his ascetism and later left it. This statement has been made before, though I have never seen its original source stated, and is objectionable to the Jains on the ground that a Tīrthaṅkara never belonged to an order founded by any one else.

Beautiful plates, twenty-eight in black and white and three in colors, are a very attractive feature of the volume. Too little has been published in the field of Jain art. An explanation of each plate was wisely added.

Johns Hopkins University. HELEN M. JOHNSON.

Lekhapaddhati. Edited by C. D. DALAL, with preface, notes and glossary by G. K. SHRIGONDEKAR. [Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. XIX.] Baroda: CENTRAL LIBRARY, 1925. Pp. xi + 130.

The Lekhapaddhati is "a guide to revenue officers and professional letter and petition writers, being a compilation of models of Government documents and specimens of official and other correspondence suitable for various occasions." Its author is unknown, but was apparently a government official at Pattan. Although the editors do not say so, it seems probable from some of the letters that the author was a Jain. The work belongs to the end of the fifteenth century; and its language, the "mixed Sanskrit" of that period, is the principal reason for its publication. The difficulties the editors encountered in interpreting this language can well be imagined, and they were very fortunate in being able to obtain assistance from the old men in the villages.

The glossary is extensive and of great value. It contains much new material, as well as words that have aready appeared in texts of that period; e. g., the ubiquitous viśopaka occurs, p. 16, here obviously a land-measure, which is interpreted as 'a vigha, a measure of land equal to 20 vasas.'

The practical usefulness and convenience of the glossary would have been infinitely increased if it had been arranged alpha- instead of only the page reference.

HELEN M. JOHNSON.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Bengali Religious Lyrics, Śakta. Selected and translated by EDWARD J. THOMPSON and ARTHUR MARSHMAN SPENCER. London: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, and Calcutta: ASSOCIATION PRESS, 1923. 104 pp.

This volume of the Heritage of India Series contains Śakta poetry of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries from Bengal. Considerably more than half of the lyrics are taken from Ramprasad Sen, 1718-1775 A. D. His songs are still very popular and are much more widely known among the villagers than those of Tagore. 'The peasants and the pandits enjoy his songs equally.

They draw solace from them in the hour of despair and even at the moment of death. The dying man brought to the banks of the Ganges asks his companions to sing Ramprasadi songs.'

More and more have Sanskritists been realizing the importance of the vernacular literatures for any adequate understanding of Indian thought and feeling as a whole. To confine our attention to Sanskrit literature is like trying to understand mediaeval Europe on the basis of the Greek and Latin literature of the Christian priesthood. The religious and philosophical literature in Sanskrit is for the most part the highly specialized literature of certain sections of the Brahman caste. The worldly literature in Sanskrit was fostered chiefly at the courts of kings. The Prākrit literature of Buddhists, Jains and Hindus was either court literature or the literature of a highly organized monkhood.

The thoughts and feelings of the people as a whole were not adequately represented in such Sanskrit and Prākrit literature. The monistic and pantheistic elements of Indian thought as developed in these specialized intellectual circles have been greatly overemphasized. There is a vague pantheistic tinge to much of Indian thought and feeling, but other elements are strongly marked even in the Sanskrit and Prākrit literatures, although they did not find adequate expression until the development of the vernacular literatures. These elements were doubtlss present in the earlier periods during which popular feeling and thought did not find literary expression, at least in our preserved Sanskrit and Prākrit literatures. Practically the majority of the people are and always have been theistic, demanding intercourse between a personal god or goddess and a personal suppliant and worshipper.

Especially strong in the lyrics of this volume is the emphasis on the motherhood rather the fatherhood of God. The mother is in closer contact with her children than the father who is engaged in the larger affairs of life and is more remote from the child. This thought goes back to the old Hindu conception of a duality in nature, male and female, and the natural disinclination to conceive of the Godhead as exclusively male. Philosophy transcends this humanistic point of view by making its ultimate reality neuter. But all through the popular phases of Hinduism runs the conception that the female principle in nature deserves as much recognition as the male principle. The Śaktas are those who feel

very strongly that the female aspect of nature is more accessible than the male and hence devote their worship chiefly to that. Śiva is Bholanath 'lord of forgetfulness,' the God who wanders abstractedly or sinks into meditation. A tangle of mythology and ritual has grown up around Śakta worship. Erotic elements and elements of terror have been interwoven but the worship is not all erotic and terrible. Śaktism contains some of the finest and some of the most revolting features of Hinduism. It is not to be condemned in its entirety as has so often been done. There is no logical reason why the Godhead should not be thought of in female terms as well as in male terms.

These lyrics have also a strong sense of practical ethics as opposed to the Indian philosophical idea that good and bad must be transcended, and that they have no final meaning.

The foolishness of pilgrimage and sacrifice is strongly emphasized. The writers cling to an absolute faith in Kālī and yet very noticeable are the frequent complaints of her carelessness and lack of attention to the individual worshipper. This trait merely reflects the general Indian attitude towards nature as not being harmonious and adaptable to human needs but as subject to ruthlessness, instability and endless change, as being beyond human control and understanding.

WALTER E. CLARK.

University of Chicago.

Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba. achtes bis fünfzehntes Buch, aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt von W. CALAND. Uitgave van de koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam: 1924. 468 pp.

It should be noted that the second part of Professor Caland's translation of the Āpastamba-Śrāuta-Sūtra is not published under the same auspices as was the first part (reviewed in this JOURNAL 44. 139): the pages are of the same size and style, the type sizes are a little larger, giving a rather better appearance to the pages. Book 8 deals with sacrifices offered at the beginnings of the seasons,—the spring, the rains, the autumn,—and a fourth somewhat indefinitely appointed for the autumn. Book 9 sets forth certain *prāyaścittas,* acts to amend faults or disturbances of the

normal course of the sacrificial procedure: these are of course interesting to all students of religious development, and many will remember that the Romans seem to have been rather more forehanded in this matter with their flute-playing to drown out ill-omened words or sounds and their offering of a piacular sacrifice "beforehand to atone for any omission in the ritual which was to follow" (Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, p. 191). In Books 10-13, covering over one-half of this part of the translation, are the directions for the *agniṣṭoma*, the most elaborate soma-sacrifice: in the prescriptions of the numerous details of this sacrifice the manner of the Śrāuta-Sūtras can be seen in extended development.

The appearance of this continuation of the translation is welcome and all interested in the subject will look hopefully for the speedy completion of it from the competent hands of Professor Caland.

L. C. Barret.

Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

Trois Conférences sur les Gâthâ de l'Avesta, faites à l'Université d'Upsal pour la Fondation Olaus Petri, par A. Meillet. *Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque de Vulgarisation, tome 44.* Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1925. 72 pp.

This little volume contains an introduction and three chapters. In the introduction, M. Meillet presents an argument for the antiquity of the text of the Gathas, against his teacher James Darmesteter, and in essential agreement with Bartholomae. He then in the first chapter gives his grounds for accepting the traditional date of Zoroaster; in the second, he interprets the disjointed nature of the Gathas as due to their having been composed partly in prose and partly in verse, of which only the verse portions have survived; in the third, he shows that the pure religion of the Gathas has been much changed and materialized in the later sections of the Avesta.

Every Iranist will be grateful to M. Meillet for this treatise, which in his keen and lucid style presents an invaluable introduction to a most difficult series of texts. Particularly the second chapter, with an exposition of Yasna 29 according to his theory, is most illuminating. One may query, however, if M. Meillet is

not too conservative in refusing (pp. 45-46) to admit the instrumental form in nominative uses in the Gathas; *raucabiš* is found as a nominative and *viθbiš* (if so it is to be normalized in orthography) as an accusative, in the Behistan inscription of Darius the Great, less than a century after Zoroaster's activity, in the face of which a view based on the evident archaizing character of the Gathas, and on nothing else, loses much of its weight.

University of Pennsylvania. ROLAND G. KENT.

The Origins of the Islamic State. Being a translation from the Arabic accompanied with annotations geographic and historic notes of the *Kitāb futûḥ al-buldân* of Al-Imâm abu-l-'Abbâs Aḥmad ibn-Jâbir al-Balâdhuri. By FRANCIS CLARK MURGOTTEN, PH. D., Associate Professor of Modern Languages, University of Nevada. Part II. New York: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, 1924.

In this volume, submitted as a Ph. D. dissertation at Columbia University, Professor Murgotten gives us the completion of the translation of al-Balâdhuri. The first part was done into English by the reviewer and published by Columbia University in 1916.

It is not my purpose exactly to review Dr. Murgotten's work, but simply to tabulate the mistakes committed by him in the process of rendition into English. These mistakes, together with their corrections, shall be classified under five main headings: I. Mistakes in Transliteration. II. Confusion of proper and common nouns. III. Mistakes due to oversight or negligence. IV. Misreading of the Arabic text. V. Mistakes due to failure to comprehend the Arabic original.

A number of passages in the book could be improved upon, reconstructed or modified to bring out a slightly different shade of meaning. Others might be considered of questionable or doubtful rendition. All such passages, however, have not been dealt with in this criticism.

Nor are the typographical errors cited, as the reader will not find them hard to detect.

I. Mistakes in Transliteration

§(1) Page 6, line 1, "ibn-abu-Waḳḳâṣ" should be ibn-abi-Waḳḳâṣ. (2) 6: 9-10, "Ḳar-aṭhah" = Ḳa-raṭhah. (3) 6: *ult.* "ibn-abu-l-Khaṣîb" = ibn-abi-l-Khaṣîb. (4) 7: 15-16, "Muḥammadîyah" = Mu-ḥammadîyah. (5) 10: 2-3, and 19: 8-9, "Ḥud-haifah" and "Ḥudh-aifah" = Ḥu-dhaifah. (6) 10: 19 "Ḥawiyyah" [1] = Ḥawîyah. (7) 11: 4 "ibn-abu-Mu'aiṭ" = ibn-abi-Mu'aiṭ. (8) 11: 5 "ibn-abu-'Amr" = ibn-abi-'Amr. (9) 11: 17 "ibn-abu-Ṭâlib" = ibn-abi-Ṭâlib.[2] (10) 12: 13-14 "Hamadhân" = Hama-dhân. (11) 19: 2-3 "Ard-abîli" = Ar-dabîli. (12) 21: 10-11 and 55: 5-6 and 118: 14-15 "Mug-hîrah" and "Mugh-îrah" = Mu-ghîrah. (13) 66: 13-14 "Khur-aibah" = Khu-raibah. (14) 110: 12 "al-Salâm" = as-Salâm.[3] (15) 120: 9-10 "Aid-haj" = Ai-dhaj. (16) 260: 11-12 "Madâ'-ini" = Madâ-'ini. (17) 263: 3-4 "Tha-'labah" = Tha'-labah.[4]

II. Confusion of Proper and Common Nouns

(1) Page 75: *paen.* "the castle of Jausaḳ" should read a castle (Arabic, *jausaḳ*). (2) 137: 4 *a f.* "the passage gifts" = the idea of giving prizes among the Arabs.[5] (3) 171: 4 *a f.* "with some success" = and Zamm.[6] (4) 185: 20-21 "Khalaf, one of his freedmen, was riding behind him" = He then jumped and rode

---

[1] This form of transliteration is, of course, possible; but the correction has been made in the interest of conformity to the system adopted by the translator himself. *Cf.* 5: 7 "al-Ḳâdisîyah," 6: 15 "al-Muḥammadîyah," *etc.*

[2] "ibn-abu" is an impossible Arabic formation, but, of course, the translator is free to use it arbitrarily if he so chooses. This formation occurs quite frequently in the book, but we shall not refer to it, hereafter, as it is easy for the reader to make it out for himself.

[3] To conform to the system of transliteration adopted by the translator himself.

[4] The above will serve as samples to illustrate the various ways in which the laws of Arabic syllabication were violated. Other mistakes belonging to the same category shall not be enumerated for lack of space.

[5] *Ma'add* is a proper noun meaning Arabs, and not a common noun as taken by the translator.

[6] *Zamm* is another name for Amul, and not a verb as treated by the translator.

behind a freedman of his (*fartadafa khalfa*[7] *maulan lahu*). (5) 222: 13 "like the Pool in al-Madînah" = like a pool in their city. (6) 224: 4 *a f.* "a liveried slave" = a Mazûni[8] slave (7) 258: 3 "cotton overcoat" = Ḳaṭawâni overcoat (*i. e.*, made in Ḳaṭawân—a quarter in al-Kûfah). (8) 274: 15-16 "charged him together with Mashâya'ah abu-Lu'lu'ah of complicity in the crime" = charged him with complicity (*mushâya'ah*)[9] with abu-Lu'lu'ah in the crime.

III. Mistakes Due to Oversight

(1) Page 3, line 1 "Kumas" *should be* Ḳûmas. (2) 4: 15 "aḍ-Dabbi" = aḍ-Ḍabbi. (3) 4: 15 & *ult.* "Âzib" = 'Âzib. (4) 8: 3 *a f.* "Madinat" = Madînat. (5) 9: 1 "Ḳazwin" = Ḳazwîn. (6) 10: 20 "Hamrâ" = Ḥamrâ'. (7) 12: 1 "al-Mutawwakkil" = al-Mutawakkil. (8) 14: 15 "Nûwaj" = Bûmaj. (9) 20: 2 *a f.* "Ḳindi" = Kindi. (10) 32: 9 "Khuwi" = Khuwai. (11) 32: 18 "Muḥârit" = Muḥârib. (12) 33: 8 "Sa'id" = Sa'îd. (13) 39: 4 "'Âmis" = 'Âmir. (14) 39: 5 "Ḥaṣîb" = Ḥabîb. (15) 45: 11 "Tamîni" = Tamîmi. (16) 45: *ult.* Insert in margin the figure 339 indicating the page in the Arabic text. (17) 57: *ult.* Insert 345 in margin. (18) 60: 3 *a f.* "al-Kaladah" = ibn-Kaladah. (19) 61: 1 "Mujâshi" = Mujâshi'. (20) 62: 2 "Dahnâ" = Dahnâ'. (21) 63: 7 "Muthanna'" = Muthanna. (22) 67: 9 Insert in margin 351. (23) 70: 16 "Tulaiḳ al-Khazâ'i" = Ṭulaiḳ al-Khuzâ'i. (24) 72: 11 *a f.* and 83: 3 *a f.* "aṭ-Ṭalḥât" = aṭ-Ṭalaḥât. (25) 73: 10 *a f.* "Khalaḳ" = Khalaf. (26) 75: 3 "Ruḳa" = Rukḳa. (27) 76: 4 & 6-7 "Ṣaḥbân" & "Ṣuḥbân" = Ṣuḥbân. (28) 82: 20-21 "aṣ-Ṣabbi" = aḍ-Ḍabbi. (29) 88: 9 *a f.* "'Ubaidallâ" = 'Ubaidallâh. (30) 90: *paen.* "Hasrukânân" = Masrukânân. (31) 98: 8 "'Umar" = 'Âmir. (32) 106: 6 *a f.* "Sîrawaih" = Shîrawaih. (33) 110: 15 "376" should be in margin of line 14. (34) 112: 12 "Mihnaf" = Mikhnaf. (35) 120: 4 *a f.* "383" should be in margin of line

[7] This word is not a proper noun "Khalaf" as taken by the translator, but an adverb of place, *khalfa* = "behind."

[8] *Mazûn* is another name for the land of 'Umân and has nothing to do with "liveries."

[9] The translator took this word, meaning "complicity," for the first name of abu-Lu'-lu'ah.

5 *a f.*[10] (36) 124: 15 "ibn-Muḥarrish" = ibn-Muḥarrish abu-Maryam al-Ḥanafi. (37) 213: 8 *a f.* "He rejoiced not with them that rejoiced" = He returned (*yakful*)[11] not with them that returned. (38) 267; 13-12 *a f.* These two lines should read thus: ʿAbd-al-Aʿla ibn-Ḥammâd an-Narsi from Ḥammâd ibn-Salamah from Dâʾûd ibn-abi-Hind from ash-Shaʿbi, *etc.* (39) 267: 8 *a f.* "lend it" = melt it (*yudhîbuha*).[12] (40) 270: 5 "Maḳkah" = Baḳḳah.[13]

IV. Misreading of Arabic Text

(1) Page 5, line 2 "ad-Dâmghân" = ad-Dâmaghân. (2) 6: 14-15 "al-Muḥa-dathah" = al-Muḥ-dathah. (3) 19: 4 *a f.* "Mîmadh" = Maimadh. (4) 20: 4 "Sablân" = Sabalân. (5) 20: 7 & 23: 24 "Mûkân" "Mûḳan" = Mûḳân. (6) 26: foot-note 1 "*Ḳariyat*" = *Ḳaryat*. (7) 47-5 *a f.* & 2 *a f.* "Sarra-man-ra'a" = Surra-man-ra'a. (8) 60: foot-note 3 "*ḳaḍabah*" = *ḳaḍbah*. (9) 61: 9 *a f.* "ath-Thûri = ath-Thauri. (10) 65: 16 "Hashâm" = Hishâm. (11) 73: 5-6 "May Allah cut off from him His mercy!" = May Allah cut off his progeny! (or leave no descendants from him) (*raḥimahu*, and not *raḥmatahu*, as read by the translator). (12) 83: 4 *a f.* & *ult.* "Khazâʿi. (13) 85: 13 "Namari" = Namiri. (14) 85: 9 *a f.* "pumpkin" = water course (*baṭîḥah*, and not *biṭṭîkhah*, as read by the translator). (15) 86: 4 "Mirwân" = Marwân. (16) 91: 3 *a f.* "Masʿab" = Muṣʿab. (17) 96: 10 *a f.* "Ḍamarah" = Ḍamrah. (18) 101: 2 *a f.* "Ḳaḍâʿah" = Ḳuḍâʿah. (19) 110: 8 *a f.* "previous to" = in the name (or in behalf) of (*min ḳibali*, and not *ḳabli*, as read by the translator). (20) 115: 5 *a f.* "Miryam" = Maryam. (21) 129: foot-note 2, "*maṣṣirat*" = *muṣṣirat*. (22) 131: foot-note 1 "*Wak-ânat shadrawân ʿilmihim wadînihim*" = *wa-kânat shâdrawân ʿilmahum wadînahum*. (23) 151: 20 "Burdaʿah" = Bardhaʿah. (24) 152: 3 "Bashar" = Bishr. (25) 163: 4

[10] There are many such mistakes in which the figure in the margin, denoting the number of the page in the Arabic text, is either entirely omitted or misplaced. No reference to such cases will hereafter be made.

[11] See de Goeje's *emendanda* at the end of al-Balâdhuri.

[12] See de Geoje's *emendanda*.

[13] There are many other mistakes due to oversight, but the above will suffice for illustration.

"Rufayy" = Rukayy. (26) 170: 21 "Ḥanifi" = Ḥanafi. (27) 187: 11 *a f.* "*reka's*" *rak'ahs.* (28) 188: 17 "Khwârizm" = Khawârizm. (29) 196: 8 *a f.* "Ḍarâr = Ḍirâr. (30) 200: 18 "send down ice (*ṣabar*) = send us endurance (*ṣabr*) (31) 229: 9 "Ḥams" = Ḥims. (32) 252: 13 "fresh herbage" = orphans (*kallan*[14] = a dependent family). (33) 257: 2 "Ruzzâḳ" = Razzâḳ. (34) 263: 10 "*ruṭl*" = *raṭl.*

V. Failure to Comprehend the Arabic Original.

(1) Page 4, line 2, "with news" = well marked as a horseman (*mu'lima* to have a distinctive mark on a horse was considered a sign of special courage). (2) 4: 3 "Not every one who hides adversity will tell" = and not all those who go to battle (*yaghsha-l-karîhata*) go marked (*yu'limu*). (3) 4: 5 "and fled not, causing blood" = and continued to cause blood to flow (*falam abraḥ udammi*). (4) 4: 9 "I am not found holding back; I press forward" = In case I find no one lagging behind (*ajid musta'-khiran*), I press forward (*ataḳaddamu*). (5) 5: 4-2 *a f.* "Did I make war upon Persia and Greece only for bread and herbs?" = And did the Persians and Byzantines fight each other (*iḳtatalat*) for anything but bread and vegetables? (6) 6: 8 *a f.* "raided" = had previously (*ḳad kâna*) raided. (7) 7: 7 "ordered" = had previous to this (*kâna ḳad*)[15] ordered. (8) 7: 14 "went to ruin" = was destroyed by a landslide or fall (*khuṣifa biha*). (9) 7: 3 *a. f.* "and wrote an account of him" = who copied a commentary [on the Koran] from him (*fakataba 'anhu-t-tafsîra*). (10) 10: *paen.-ult.* "How often we crossed in the darkness of the jungle From mountain steep and from plain below" = For behold how many rough mountains and extensive plains we have crossed under the cover of intense darkness (*duja-l-ghayâhîbi*). (11) 11: 5-2 *a f.* "with which every one used to rub himself. It is said that if a sprig from it was stuck to the ground, it would put forth leaves until a tree grew from it" = from which the common people sought blessing by touching it (*yatamassaḥu biha-l-'âmmah*). It is said that this tree grew out of ar-Rabî's tooth-

[14] See de Geoje's *emendanda*, also ibn-al-Althîr, "*an-Nihâyah*," 4: 32.

[15] There are many other such cases, in which the value of *kâna* and *ḳad* is not fully appreciated, but we shall not enumerate them for the sake of brevity.

pick (*siwâk*) which he had stuck into the ground and which soon after sprouted (*fa-auraḳa*). (12) 12: *paen.* "farmers" = serfs (*muzâri'ûn,* tenants holding the land for their master according to feudal usage). (13) 13: 2 "on it accepted Islâm" = accepted Islâm on condition that they would hold it (*aslamu 'alaihi*). (14) 13: 4 "since they were paying to him a double tithe" = with the understanding ('*ala*) that they would pay a second tithe (*'ushran thâniyan*). (15) 13: 10-9 *a f.* "I was acquainted with" = I was a contemporary of (*adraktu,* literally: I overtook or came up with). (16) 13: 5-4 *a f.* "Thy father did not try to trace among the Arabs his descent but rather among the Persians." = Thy father never preferred over his Persian descent an Arab kinship (*wilâyat fi-l-'arab*). (17) 15: 13 "My friends" = my two friends (*khalîlayya*). (18) 19: 3-4 "who had heard" = who were his contemporaries (*adraḳahum*). (19) 20: 14-15 "in possession of a treaty, but some of them had broken it" = living up to the terms of their treaty (*'ala-l-'ahdi*). Other districts (*nawâḥin*), however, rose up against him. (20) 21: 6 "the *Wâli* of the *'âmirs* of the provinces wrote to him (Sa'd)" = and he ['Umar] wrote to him [Sa'd] and to (*wa-ila,* not *wâli* as read by translator) the governors of provinces. *Delete* foot-note 1. (21) 22: 10 *a f.* "the food and clothing of whose people is infected with death" = whose people eat among other things the forbidden food of dead animals and wear their skins (*yukhâliṭu ṭi'âma ahliha wali-bâsahum-ul-maitata*).[16] (22) 25: 6-8 "To these Arabs the villages turned for protection, and the [native] inhabitants became cultivators of the soil for them" = with a view to securing safety, the villages were put under the vassalage (*uljiʾat*) of the Arabs, and thus the inhabitants became serfs[17] (*muzâri'în*). (23) 25: 10-11 "which became proverbial" = which had recently been conquered (*ittukhidhata ḥadîthan*). (24) 27: 5 *a f.* "the greater part of it" = its capital, or its chief city (*ḳaṣabatuhu*). (25) 34: 6 *a f.* "tore it up" = violated its terms (*kharaḳahu*). (26) 56: 14-13 *a f.* "led a godfearing life until he had the affair with the woman" = remained in office (*aḳâma*) as long as it pleased Allah (*ma shâ'Allah*), and then he had the love episode (*hawa*) with that

[16] The reference is undoubtedly to the Koran 2: 168.

[17] This is clearly a description of the process of feudalizing the newly conquered lands.

woman. (27) 68: 4-3 *a f.* "thou shalt not assign it to him except with good will" = thou shalt not interfere with him (*ta'ruḍ lahu*) except in so far as it is good. (28) 69: 5 "granted fields" = granted fiefs. (29) 70: 6 "lied concerning the charges made against him" = declared false (*kadhdhaba*) the charges made against him. (30) 70: 17-18 "abu-l-Jarrâḥ, who had been imprisoned by ibn-az-Zubair" = abu-l-Jarrâḥ, who was the master (or warden, *ṣâḥib*) of ibn-az-Zubair's prison-house. (31) 71: 8 *a f.* "It was on one" = He was in charge (*wakâna 'ala*). (32) 71: 7 *a f.* "tribe" = city. (33) 73: 11 "Pass by" = Complete the verse (*ajiz*). (34) 73: 11 "Give way" = Well, begin (*hâti*). (35) 74: 6-7 "and he guarded against the likes of himself, being himself a robber" = many a man guards against the like of this, while he himself is a guardian (*ḥâris*). (36) 80: 19-20 "receiving the honor" = his act being regarded as a source of blessing (or as auguring well, *tabarrukan bihi*). (37) 80: 4 *a f.* "washerman" = bleacher (*ḳaṣṣâr*),: 3 *a f.* "to wash" = to bleach. (38) 84: 4 *a f.* "only because of a joke there was about it" = because of disputes (*munâza'ât*) regarding it. (39) 85: 2-4 "He presented al-Ḥajjâj with a carpet, and the latter returned the compliment by granting him" = He had (*kâna*) presented al-Ḥajjâj with a horse (*farasan*) on which the latter won a race (*sabaḳa 'alaihi*), so he [al-Ḥajjâj] granted him as fief, *etc.* (40) 88: 12 "his usual division" = that was his usual grant to the common people (*al-'âmmah*). (41) 89: 5-4 *a f.* "had criticized Khâlid, accusing him of wrongdoing, and Khâlid had heard of it" = had presented himself (*ashkhaṣa*) before Khâlid and complained that he was dealt with unfairly (*taṭhallama*), and Khâlid had believed him (*ḳabila ḳaulahu*). (42) 90: 7-6 *a f.* "Nay, and indeed, even if thou art dispossessed, I shall proceed against thee" = Verily, if (*la'in*) thou art dismissed from office (*'uzilta*), I shall bring a case against (or sue) thee. (43) 91: 8 "but he sold it" = and he [Bilâl] bought it (*fashtarâha*). (44) 91: 11 *a f.* "practically possessed it" = took it by force (*ghalaba 'alaihi* = wrested or usurped it). (45) 95: 11 "bequeathed" = instituted as *waḳf* (or religious foundation). (46) 96: 11-10 *a f.* "granted . . . in fee" = granted . . . as fief. (47) 97: 13-14 "and he succeeded" = but he did him good instead (*fanafa'ahu*). (48) 97: foot-note "lit. butterfly" = lit. low, flat land. (49) 99:

14 "lighten their burdens" = reduce his share of the produce (*yukhaffifu muḳâsamatahum*). (50) 99: 16-17 "bound himself by oath to the people on terms agreeable to them" = accepted as his share (*ḳâsama,* not *aḳsama* with which it was confused by the translator) whatever they were willing to give (*raḍau bihi*). (51) 109: 4-2 *a f.* "taking away the best that the people who came in ships had, by cheating them to the best of their ability" = taking those who came in ships unawares (*yuṣîbu ghirratan*) and running away with whatever they could rob them of. (52) 110: 12-13 "'Ujaif ordered the water shut off, which was done in spite of great difficulties" = he ordered 'Ujaif to have the water shut off, which was done by means of huge dams (*mu'an* = heavy weights). (53) 110: 14 "without any casualties" = and not one of them escaped (*falam yashudhdha minhum aḥadun*). (54) 110: 7-6 *a f.* "at the accession of 'Ali" = until 'Ali's arrival (*ḳudûm*). (55) 166: 12 "Tell ibn-Badr: Thou that rulest an empire" = O, Ḥârith ibn-Badr, thou hast become the ruler of a province (*walîta imâratan*). (56) 118: 4 "The deserter from the Persians set to killing his family and his children and throwing" = The Persians then began each (*waja'ala-r-rajulu*) to kill his own family and children and throw. (57) 118: 11-12 "and asked him to spare his life. His request was granted" = who spared his life and assigned him a stipend (*fastaḥyâḥu wafaraḍa lahu*). (58) 119: 13 "pardon" = a stipend (*faraḍa lahu*). (59) 121: 9 "though the best would not have sufficed us" = and the best of things is that which (*ma,* which the translator mistook for a negative) sufficeth. (60) 121: 13-15 "rebelled. Mukram came up with him at Aidhaj, but Kharzâd fortified himself in the fortress of that name" = rebelled, went as far as Aidhaj, and fortified himself in a fortress known by his name.[18] (61) 122: 7-8 "For what is the joy his soul promised him. From al-Ḥusaini or 'Amr in very sooth?" = For verily what he had promised himself to wrest From al-Ḥusaini or 'Amr is incredible.[19] (62) 135: 4 "We cannot tell the difference" = we make no distinction. (63) 137: *paen. & ult.* should read: Their spears measure more than eight

[18] The pronouns and their antecedents in this sentence caused the confusion for the translator.

[19] *ma* which introduces the verse is a negative, and not an interrogative, particle as translated.

and ten,[20] when contrasted with others in warfare. (64) 138: 6-5 *a f.* "which was afterwards bought by" = which he sold (*fabâ-'aha*) after the flight of (*ba'da harabi*). (65) 146: 5 *a f.* "withstand" = take the place of (*yaḳûmu maḳâma*). (66) 149: 5 "aided and abetted them" = took advantage of the situation (*ṭami'a fîhim*). (67) 153: 4 "the sun" = prayer (*ṣalât*). (68) 154: 10-11 "treated him generously, pensioning him and his chieftains" = received him with special regard (*akramahu*), granted him a stipend (*faraḍa lahu*), and made him commander of an army (*ḳawwadahu*). (69) 155: 15-16 "He stayed there" = conditions ran smooth, (*i. e.*, there were no disturbances, *istaḳâmat lahu*). (70) 165: 6-7 "from which cattle were exported" = from which they drove before them (*wastâḳat*) cattle [as booty]. (71) 166: 17-18 "accompanied by drums, seeking the drum-master and killing him" = carrying drums, seeking each drummer separately and killing him. (Foot-note 1 should be *deleted*). (72) 171: 3-4 "was pleased with him" = sought his blessing (*tabarraka bihi*). (73) 171: 9-10 "asking us about the history of the land and saying to one of the people of aṣ-Ṣaghâniyân" = asking one of the people of aṣ-Saghâniyân who was studying traditions with us (*kâna yaṭlubu-l-ḥadîtha ma'ana*). (74) 172: 15 "liberated them" = assigned stipends to them (*faraḍa lahum*). (75) 173: 13-14 "while the wounds among them were healing" = suffering because of the many wounds inflicted upon them (*waḳad fashat fîhim al-jirâḥ*). (76) 174: 13-14 "It is said that Nahâr ibn-Tausi'ah wrote about Ḳutaibah the stanzas which begin": = Others say that is was Nahâr ibn-Tausi'ah who wrote the above verses about Ḳutaibah and that the poem begins with the following: (77) 175: 15 "slayer of" = slain by (*ḳatîl*). (78) 177: 9 *a f.* "to our hurt" = and not we (*dûnana*). (79) 178: 5-3 *a f.* "For a horse could only be speared in the nostrils, unless it turned around" = For whenever a horse is speared in the nostrils it is sure to run away. (80) 179: 9 *a f.* "to refer the matter of the people of Marw to him" = to meet him at the head of the people of Marw (*ya'tîhi fi ahli marw*). (81) 181: 15-16 "urged the raiding of Bukhâra. Then they both went" = resolved to raid (*'azama 'ala*) Bukhâra and then proceed.[21] (82)

[20] They measured spears by the grip of the hand (*ḳabḍah*).

[21] *atayân* is an infinitive noun and not a dual verb as supposed by the translator.

182: 6 "In the year 99" = in the year 79 (as corrected by de Goeje and should be transposed to the end of the third line = He appointed in the year 79 *etc.*). (83) 183: *paen.-ult.* "The boldness of these two brothers was of great service to Mûsa" = They, therefore came to exercise great influence (*'aṭhumat dâl-latuhuma*) over Mûsa. (84) 184: 17 "Baḥshûra" = Ḥashûra.[22] (85) 184: 12 *a f.* "as a mediator" = to condole with (*kalmu'azzi*). (86) 184: 11 *a f.* "and he accomplished the following" = on account of a calamity that had befallen him. (87) 184: 11-10 *a f.* "He gained an audience with Thâbit" = He took Thâbit unaware (or by surprise, *faltamasa-l-ghirrata*). (88) 188: 4 *a f.* "1,200,-000" = 2,200,000. (89) 191: 2 *a f.* "in regard to his governorship" = confirming him in the governorship. (90) 193: 9 & 194: 11 "mother of his children" = concubine (*umm waladihi* = a maid who bore him children and was, therefore, freed). (91) 196: 4-2 *a f.* "How shall I pray for a master who has killed a number of ours, all of them mere boys, and felt no anger in their behalf?" = How could I pray to a Lord who was not moved by anger for the fact that their common people (*'âmmatuhum*) had killed so many of our young boys? (92) 205: 21 "his blessing" = rich presents and allowances (*ṣilâtihim wa-arzâkahum*). (93) 210: 2-1 *a f.* "How much more expeditions in manoeuvering these barbarians were than we!" = Why should these barbarians be more entitled to making their horses more swift by docking their tales (*aula bit-tashmîri*) than we. (94) 218: 15 "and the consequent dismay of the unbelievers was great" = and this was considered bad omen (*ṭiyarat*)[23] by the unbelievers. (95) 231: 6 "and his name was blessed" = and the people sought his blessing (*i. e.*, treated him as a saint). (96) 232: 8-9 "He built a highway known as the highway of the Mîd." = He dammed the canal with a dam still known as the Mîd Dam (*sikr*). (97) 237: 16 "just as other Moslems" = on this there is no disagreement (among Moslem jurists) (*wala-khtilâfa fi dhâlika*). (98) 238: 13 "Whether he sow or not. Allah knows best" = in case he sows it. But in case he refuses to sow it, then he knows what will happen. (99) 238: 3-2 *a f.* "Allah knows best what is collected

[22] The *ba* is a preposition and not a part of the proper noun.

[23] See de Goeje's *emendanda*.

from it" = he [the owner] knows best what he gets from it. (100) 242: 1 "we shall not be pardoned in this world" = we could not have attained glory in this world. (101) 244: 11 *a f.* "provided for them an issue" = increased their allowance (*wassa'a 'alaihim*). (102) 247: 6-7 "God bless me" = Glory be (*subḥâna*) to God. (103) 251: 9 "Thy relationship has drawn thee" = Thy relationship is also a blood relationship (*raḥim*). (104) 255: 6 *a f.* "adopted heir" = executor or trustee (*waṣi*). (105) 258: 4 & 8-9 "and had his servant follow" = riding behind his maid (*ardafa jâriyatahu*). (106) 259: 8 "gave him a present" = shared with him the fortune [which he had unlawfully acquired] (*ḳâsamahu*).

PHILIP K. HITTI.

American University of Beirut.

Karagös. Türkische Schattenspiele. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und erklärt von HELLMUT RITTER. Erste Folge. Hannover: H. LAFAIRE, 1924. viii + 191 pp., 48 tables.

The Haft Paikar (The Seven Beauties) by Nizami of Ganja. Transl. with a commentary by C. E. WILSON. 2 vols. London: PROBSTHAIN & Co., 1924. xix + 288, and 212 pp.

Lovers of the Turkish popular theatre and scholars interested in the subject will be very grateful to Mr. Ritter for his excellent treatise on Karagös, the Turkish puppet theatre. In the preface the author tells about the origin of the collection of dolls in his possession while writing the present work. Forty-eight illustrations of the dolls, of which eight are in colors, constitute the most valuable item in the book, which moreover is excellently edited. In the fourteen pages of introduction is given a concise review of the history of the theatre and of its arrangement; this review is almost exclusively based on the German literature on the subject. In the next 170 pages we find, in transliteration and translation, the text of the three plays of Karagös.

Unfortunately, up to the present time the Russian language has not been studied widely by scholars; only very few can familiarize

themselves with the literature in that language on their speciality. It is to be deplored that on this account the Russian literature on Oriental studies, which is very extensive, must ever remain a sealed book to many authors to whom an acquaintance with this material would be very useful. This deprivation is evident in the book under discussion.

As early as 1909-1910 I was writing a series of articles on Karagös in *Jivaya Starina,* the periodical of the ethnographic section of the Russian Geographic Society. These articles were later edited in a separate volume bearing the title "The Turkish Popular Karagös Theatre." In the same work was given a translation (based, it is true, on the text of Kunos-Radloff) of two of the three plays edited now by Mr. Ritter. Further on in the preface was a complete bibliography on the subject up to 1910 from which our author could inform himself of the vast extent of the literature on Karagös, and learn that there were numerous works on the subject in many European languages, as, for instance, even in Rumanian.

It is unfortunate that the author has not contributed anything new in his introduction on the history, origin, and development of this theatre. This is an extremely important and complicated subject and the excellent material (puppets) in the author's hands should have suggested many new ideas on the subject. At least one would have expected that more detailed use would have been made of what had already been so splendidly worked over by Dr. Jacob in his study.

Notwithstanding certain deficiencies, scholars and especially ethnographers must be grateful to Mr. Ritter for his book, and especially for the tables.

The second of the works we are surveying is an English translation with commentaries of the well-known poem *Haft Paiker* or "The Seven Beauties" of the famous Persian poet Nizami. The first volume contains a preface, introduction, and translation; the second, a most extensive commentary.

It is quite difficult to appraise the translation as no original text is given, and besides, it is based on several manuscripts. But the name of Prof. Wilson is a guarantee of the excellence of the translation. We still remember his translations from Jalal-ad-Din and others.

For specialists, of course, the second volume or commentary is of much greater interest. Here, indeed, we have on almost every page a wealth of very interesting material, notes, etc., often accompanied by a most acute scholarly analysis. In general it can be said that European literature on Persian poetry has been enriched by a valuable contribution.

N. N. MARTINOVITCH.

Columbia University.

The Gospel of St. John according to the Earliest Coptic Manuscript. Edited with a translation by Sir HERBERT THOMPSON, London, 1924. xxxix + 70 pp. + 43 plates.

All Coptic and New Testament scholars will welcome the appearance of this handsome volume. The book opens with a narrative of the discovery of the papyrus near the village of Hamamieh in March, 1923. This manuscript, which is our oldest Coptic manuscript, is important not only for its antiquity and its peculiar readings; of very few New Testament manuscripts do we know so much. This papyrus, called Q, originally consisted of fifty leaves of which forty-three are extant. In fixing the date, the editor, on the eminent authority of Sir Frederic Kenyon, assigns it to the third quarter of the fourth century. He gives us a careful description of the handwriting and a detailed enumeration of errors, readings peculiar to Q, and omissions.

The section on the dialect of Q is very interesting and valuable. The dialect in which the text is written, stands between Achmimic and Sahidic, and so the editor aptly calls it the Sub-Achmimic. His catalogue of grammatical peculiarities is important; this is followed by notes on the vocabulary, where he records the cases in which the word in the Sahidic version is replaced by a different word and not merely by a dialect form in Q. This whole section is of great philological value to the student of Coptic.

Though the version is the same as that found in later Sahidic manuscripts, Q also has some independent readings; in some instances Q shows its primitive character by preserving the true text, where all late Sahidic manuscripts have suffered corruptions. All these variations have been noted with true scholarly thoroughness,

and the entire manuscript is collated with the Greek text of Westcott-Hort. The study of the text is exhaustive in all details and is indispensable to any one who is interested in the Coptic versions of the Bible.

The main portion of the book, the Coptic Text, has a facsimile plate facing each page of the text. This work has been exceedingly well done. At the foot of each page are valuable textual notes. The book concludes with a Coptic Glossary, a List of Foreign Words, Proper Names, and an English Translation.

Sir Herbert Thompson has performed a very thorough piece of work and has left nothing to be desired. This excellent and attractive book should be in the library of every Coptist and New Testament scholar.

HENRY S. GEHMAN.

Philadelphia.

PERSONALIA

Dr. HELEN M. JOHNSON, now Johnston Scholar in Sanskrit in the Johns Hopkins University, is working on Hemacandra's great collection of lives of the Jain saints and heroes, known as the Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra. She purposes to prepare a translation of this entire work, with extensive notes and addenda, constituting in the end a sort of Encyclopedia of Jainism.

Professor E. WASHBURN HOPKINS retires at the end of this year from the Edward E. Salisbury Professorship of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Yale University, the chair formerly occupied by WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY. Professor FRANKLIN EDGERTON of the University of Pennsylvania has been appointed his successor. Professor EDGERTON has been granted leave of absence for study and travel in India during the year 1926-7.

Professor CHARLES R. LANMAN also retires this year from the Wales Professorship of Sanskrit at Harvard University, of which he was the first incumbent. His successor has not yet been announced.

Professor LOUIS H. GRAY, of the University of Nebraska, has been appointed Professor of Sanskrit in Columbia University.

Dr. W. NORMAN BROWN of the Johns Hopkins University, newly appointed Editor of the Society's Journal, has been appointed Professor of Sanskrit at the University of Pennsylvania to succeed Professor EDGERTON, and will assume duties there at the opening of the academic session.

THE BHIKSHUGĪTA OR MENDICANT'S SONG

The Parable of the Repentant Miser

Justin E. Abbott
Summit, New Jersey

The eleventh Skandha and twenty-third chapter of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa contains the Bhikshugīta, the Mendicant's Song. According to its contents, it may be called "The Parable of the Repentant Miser."

The parable is told by Śrī Krishṇa to Uddhava, who had expressed doubt whether it was possible for a man to attain that perfect Śānti, or peace of mind, which would enable him to endure every form of insult without disturbing that peace. Śrī Krishna assures him that it is possible, and relates the parable of the miser, whose sole purpose in life was the accumulation of wealth, by means fair or foul. He gained enormous riches but ended in losing it all, through the Five natural enemies of wealth, "relatives, the king, thieves, fire, and disease." Having lost all and being reduced to the direst poverty, he repents of his wasted life. He determines to become a *sannyāsī,* no more to lust after riches. After wandering about to sacred places he finally returns to his native town. Some believe his conversion is real. Others think him a hypocrite. By those who disbelieve in him he is insulted and badly maltreated, but he shows the genuineness of his repentance and conversion by receiving every form of insult in silence, with forgiveness, and without any expression of ruffled feelings. All this is told briefly in the Sanskrit text of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, in 62 verses.

The Maratha Saint Eknāth (died 1609) wrote a commentary on this 11th skandha of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, known as the Eknāthi Bhāgavata. In this Commentary the story of the miser, the Bhikshugīta, is expanded into 1004 verses, by introducing details natural to Indian life, and philosophizing on the problems connected with wealth, thus adding greatly to the interest of the story, making it more vivid and more appealing to the mind and conscience. As a full translation of Eknāth's version of the story would be too long for this paper, I give a brief abstract of a translation, as follows.

"In the city of Avanti, in the country of Mālava, there lived a Brahman who gained his wealth through agriculture and trade." "He became enormously wealthy," and correspondingly miserly. "He ate as little as possible, and what he did eat was inferior food." "Naturally then his wife, children, and servants did not have enough for their appetites." "He would spend nothing on religious rites." "Even in his dreams he never did an act of charity." "Brahmans and guests, who came to share his hospitality, had to turn away hungry." "So low did he fall that he forgot his Brahmanhood, and would even accept food from an outcaste." "He became a great knave, a clever swindler, and a pure rascal." "In his lust for money he was quite equal to the killing of a Brahman or a cow." "The mere mention that a chance guest had arrived made him faint away." "What hope could they have of food or even water, at his door!" "The rats had to leave his house, finding no food there." Even that ever present Indian crow "flew away from a place so devoid of reward." "The sparrows could find no loose grain." "Ants, wearied by continual fasting, had to change their lodgings," so bare was his board. "At harvest-time, when fruit was abundant in the market, he only saw it with his eyes. He never allowed his tongue to embrace it." "His avariciousness was so great, that he quarrelled with his own tongue, and would not permit it and sweet juices to come together." "His clothes were dirty and in tatters. His head was always filthy and unkempt. His breath was offensive, because even in his dreams he was unwilling to incur the expense of chewing the fragrant *pān supāri.*" "He refused to perform the special religious duties of his Brahmanhood. He gave nothing whatever to others."

This intense love of money, and his miserliness, brought him wealth, but not friends. "His wife, children, relatives, servants, and friends all turned against him." "He never invited his married daughter back to the old home on any festal occasion, and in her anger she cursed him." "Relatives began to remark to one another, "It would be a good thing if he died. We should then, at least, have some rice and milk to eat." He was thus negligent of his special religious duties, and refused to perform the *Pancha-yajña,* or the Five sacrifices of wealth, namely in the worship of God, in benefactions to others, in honoring Brahmans and saints, in due care of parents while living and ceremonies to their manes

when dead, and in consecration of one's wealth at the feet of one's religious teacher. The natural result of his miserliness followed: "his life here below became void, as did also his expected life hereafter."

His refusal to share his wealth with those who had a right to a share aroused to activity the "Five-natural-participants-of-wealth," namely prospective heirs, thieves, the king, fire, and disease. Consequently his wife and children, conspiring together, found and made away with some of his secreted money. "Burglars broke into his treasure vaults." "His houses took fire and burned to the ground." "Pests destroyed his grain fields." "His business enterprises failed." "His ships were lost at sea." "Swindlers passed false coin on him." "In the conflicts between his own country's armies and foreign armies, his house was dug into and the treasures concealed beneath the cellar were carried away by the basket-full." "Rain leaked into his grain-cellars and rotted his grain." "Disease attacked his cattle. His stable-horses were forcibly borrowed, and in the great war fell on the battle-field." Some of his wealth he had so effectually hidden under ground that he could not find the place again. "Even his bodily appearance seemed now different. His complexion changed. No one could recognize him as a Brahman. If he said 'I am a Brahman,' no one would believe him." "People began now to insult him. Widows and orphans spat on him. He could get nothing to eat. He begged from house to house but no one would give him anything. Instead they would say 'You ill-starred wretch, what have you come here for? You were a lover of money. You were deceived by that love. God has rightly robbed you of it now.'"

"Although the wealth of this avaricious man had disappeared, the memory of that wealth had not disappeared." "In his agony of grief he felt as a serpent feels when a thorn has pierced its head; as a lizard feels when its tail is broken off, or as a fish feels out of water." "He broke out into sobs. Streams of tears flowed from his eyes." At first he was inclined to blame Fortune. "O Brahmadeva, you wicked Being, what evil fortune have you written on my forehead?" A burst of bitter tears followed. But gradually better thoughts filled the mind of this old fortune-smitten miser. "This torture which I now suffer is after all small," he said to himself. "A greater pain awaits me hereafter. I have

given nothing of my wealth to others. I have not remembered God. Now the terrors of Hell are before me. Who is there to deliver me? I am altogether a wrong-doer. I am sinking, I am sinking into the horrible pit. Hasten to my help, O Śrī Hari. Save me, a poor miserable wretch. O Krishṇa, Mādhava, Murāri, Achuta, Ananta, Śrī Hari, save me, a poor miserable sinner! You saved Prahlāda, You saved Ahilyā, You saved wicked Ajāmila, You saved vile Pingalā. O Chakrapāṇi, by that same miracle save me, a wretched sinner! Damn, damn my desire for wealth! My life has been spent in vain. Instead of spending my wealth in benevolence, all my efforts were but to add to my wealth." "Such is the great marvel of the love of money, that it gives one happiness neither in this life nor in the next." "The sufferings of inescapable Hell are now before me, a Hell so deep that it requires a *kalpa* (4,320,000,000 years) to sink to its bottom." "I received a superior Brahman birth. I have made it of no account, through this love for money." "Now in the fierce fire of remorse my life is fast slipping away."

"A strange change has taken place." "My love of money has now gone. An intense disgust for worldly riches has arisen in me." "O the evil that Avarice brings! Avarice turns what is pure into the impure. Listen to an illustration. Of noble birth, most lovely in form, her whole being altogether attractive, but on her nose a small white spot of leprosy. All her beauty is now lost in contempt. Such is Avarice. The slightest spot of it spoils nobility, generosity, victory and reputation. There is nothing in the three worlds that brings disrepute as does Avarice."

Bringing to his mind the fifteen evils that result from the lust for wealth, fraud, untruth, hypocrisy, avarice, malice, pride, overbearing spirit, haughtiness, enmity, suspicion, selfishness, immorality, drunkenness and gambling, he contrasts with this the true value of a human birth and its possibilities for good, and of the proper use of wealth, should Fortune place it in one's lap. He sees very clearly now that the lust for wealth and its enjoyment while slipping down into Hell through wrong-doing "is like the frog that is enjoying the fly in its mouth, while slipping down the throat of a serpent." So deciding on the ascetic's life as his true path, he cries out in remorse for the past and with determination

for the future: "O God of Gods, together with all the multitude of gods and goddesses, help me I pray You!"

The now converted miser was not unaware that he would be criticized. "Some may say to me: 'You have come to the end of your life. You are merely a decrepit old man. Why do you in vain take all this trouble in your old age?' But I reply: 'Do not think of this thus. The famous king Khaṭvānga attained in a moment the supreme riches, receiving his highest good. I may have a much longer life yet than he had. If God is my help in all things, I may attain also the Supreme riches in a moment's time.'" "The chief cause for my lusting after wife, son, kin, and riches, has been my desire for self-gratification. To these I now make my final obeisance." "My final bow to wife, children, and riches. My final bow to my caste, and to all who belong to me. My final bow to self-gratification. There is now no relation between you and me."

"As the lotus-leaf, although in the water, is not wet with the water, so the repentant miser, untouched by self-gratification, entered with the prescribed rites into the order of the *Sannyāsi*." "Other *sannyāsis* in offering the burnt sacrifice say (during the ceremony): 'Anger and desire are burned away.' But when the oil and butter in the sacrifice are burned away, anger and desire are still in their hearts." But such was not this miser's sacrifice. All tendencies to wrong thinking were burned up. He made a complete burnt offering of anger and desire, together with all pride." "And having thus made a burnt sacrifice of himself he became a three-staff *sannyāsi*, and began with joy his care-free wanderings."

"He wandered alone over the earth. In his enlightenment he was conscious only of his soul. He lived in forests. Only for begging food did he enter a city." Continuing to wander for many years over the country he suddenly appeared at Avanti, now a very old man. For according to a custom prescribed by the Achārya, "after entering the order of the *sannyāsi* one should at least once visit his old home."

"When the people of Avanti saw him, they exclaimed: 'Look you, that Brahman miser, having lost his property, has become a *sannyāsi*.'" "The bad people of the town began to surround him, and thinking to irritate him fell at his feet." "Some asked him about his hoards of money." One remarked: "He probably has

dug a hole in the ground and filled it with his money. That is the way with these three-staff *sannyāsis.*" With this "they grossly insulted him and snatched away his three staves." "One seized away his blanket, and left him only his clout." "But although these evil men did these things to him, yet his mind was not shaken from its purpose. He uttered not a word." "In the fulness of his brave heart he forgave them." The petty persecutions of these bad men continued, seeing they could not arouse him to anger. "Look here," they cried, "he is not truly a *sannyāsi.* Why, he is the former miser of our town! He does not say yes or no to this. This silence is his method of roguery." "Some, swearing that they would make him talk, crowded around him." One said: "It will not take a moment for me to blow sky high his vow of silence. I know how to make him yell aloud;" and this most evil-minded man poured filth on the *sannyāsi's* head, as he sat eating. But still "there came no anger to his heart." "Then they spat in his face. 'Kick him,' said one, and they did so, while another gave him a blow on his head. 'Don't let us cease,' said another, 'until we make him talk.'" Some from a distance pierced his heart with their "sharp word-arrows." "We know the real meaning of his yellow robe. It is to cover his roguery, his evil deeds, and his hypocrisy. Under the guise of a mendicant he is a wandering spy. Seize him. He is a real thief." Then they bound his two hands together with a strong cord. They reviled him: "In order to get food he is wearing the guise of a *sannyāsi.* This shameless fellow is only putting on the appearance of worthiness. He was formerly a deceiver. Now he is a hypocritical *sannyāsi.* The great rascal! Great in his silence! Here he is to cheat us. Any one who may beat him will incur no blame. He is a mighty one among hypocrites! He remains firm in his vow of silence. Although we pester him, he is as unmoved as Mount Meru when attacked by a swarm of locusts. Just as a crane adopts silence in order to catch a fish and swallow it, so we must understand his silence." One said: "He is Bravery in visible form," and with that he began to kick him. One ran a straw up his nostrils, saying: "Come look at his calmness." "Thus they pestered him, and made fun of him in many ways. Still no anger arose in his heart. He was unmoved in his calmness." "And the more they saw his calmness the more these evil people were excited against him." "They marked his face with lampblack." "They

filled his nostrils with vile odors." "And still, such was his composure, that not the least anger came to his heart." They bound him with a chain and brought him to the public square. "Recognize him," they cried; "this is that miser, that evil-doer. We have discovered him here to-day, this great rogue, this hypocrite." "They tied him, as a juggler ties a monkey, and pulled him back and forth." But the *sannyāsi* smiled to himself, thinking how they were getting pleasure from all this. "My body is experiencing the fruit of deeds done in a former birth," he said to himself. "This does not affect me, my soul." And with this thought he forgave them fully, and would do nothing to pain any one in return for the evil they did him.

The mendicant further reasoned as follows: "Mankind is bound by the results of deeds done in a former birth." "It is necessary to suffer them. King and subject alike cannot be free from this law." "So although maltreated by those evil people, the *Sannyāsi* did not lose his calmness of mind. He controlled himself with noble courage, and his righteous state of mind was unshaken." He philosophized on the Soul, and on the causes that lead to joy and suffering, rebirth, and all that is related to this worldly existence, and then concluded: "By my good fortune in a former birth, I see arisen in me the consciousness that I am Ātma, Soul (not body), and through this consciousness I bear the sorrows of this life." "By means of this I obtain eternal happiness." "In order to go across the difficult sea of this worldly existence, this right thinking (*viveka*) is a well-devised ship. Here the *Sadguru* is the helmsman, and takes me across to the Beyond." "How to get possession of this right-reasoning, one need not be in doubt. With trust and sincerity let one approach God. Putting away fear of public opinion, throwing down the burden of pride, let one approach God. Then one will receive this right-reasoning (*viveka*). Just as an infant with complete trust comes for help to its mother alone, so with the same exclusive trust one should come to Hari. If one approaches Hari, birth and death will not so much as show their faces. What can harm one if Hari is there to protect his *bhaktaṣ?* If with trust and undoubting mind the worshipper reverences the *saguṇ* and the *nirguṇ* God, or even repeats his name, the heart becomes pure in its feelings." "Bhakti is to be considered pure only when there is in it the love of God. With this

feeling of love God, the Glorious Lord, is pleased, and gives His peace to the Seeker."

The story of the repentant miser ends with the attention of the reader called to the blessings that come from reading or listening to this Song of the Mendicant (Bhikshugīta). So may I hope that Eknāth's wish may be realized by the readers of this parable, and that they may be helped by it to calmness and peace of mind, in the vicissitudes of their lives in this their worldly existence.

ON BINDING-REEDS, BITUMEN, AND OTHER COMMODITIES IN ANCIENT BABYLONIA

GEORGE A. BARTON
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN *AJSL*, XXVII, 322 ff., XXVIII, 207 ff., and XXIX, 138 ff. the writer some fifteen years ago interpreted three tablets in which large quantities of reeds used in binding were accounted for, along with certain kinds of valuable woods and grain. These tablets were Barton's HLC, no. 24, and Thureau-Dangin's RTC, nos. 305 and 306. While the translations there given could now at some points be improved, the texts there interpreted made it clear that in Babylonian commerce reeds were employed in large numbers, and that particular attention was given to harvesting reeds suitable for this purpose. We also learned that, when harvested, they were carefully counted and stored away. Careful account was also kept of those given out for use, and of the stock remaining on hand. The three tablets thus translated all came from Lagash and represented the usage of one Babylonian city only. Two other tablets have since come to light, both of which are from the city Umma, the near neighbor of Lagash. Reasoning from our own use of the word "binding" I formerly inferred that the Babylonians employed the reeds as binding-twine. Professor Chiera tells me, however, that he observed at Ur that reeds were used with bitumen in building, a layer of reeds covered with bitumen being placed between layers of unburned bricks to hold a wall together. As bitumen is accounted for as well as reeds in one of the tablets translated below, it seems probable that these "binders" were "binders" of walls to hold them together and not used for twine. One of the new tablets is at Yale and has been published by Keiser, the other is in Paris and has been published by de Genouillac.

The one at Yale [1] reads as follows:

Obverse

1. 600 × 5 + 60 × 4 + 4 *sa-gi še-ta šám-a*	1. 3244 binding-reeds bought with grain,

[1] Yale Babylonian Collection, Vol. IV, no. 323.

2. *dup* 25 *ur-an-nu-sud-da*	2. account 25 of Ur-Anusudda;
3. 3600 + 60 × 3 + 50 *sa-gi še-ta šám-a*	3. 3830 binding-reeds bought with grain,
4. *dup* 25 ^{d}*šara-kam*	4. account 25 of Shara;
5. 3600 + 600 × 2 + 60 × 6 + 35 *sa-gi še-ta šám-a*	5. 5195 binding-reeds purchased with grain,
6. 60 × 6 + 8 *sa-gi en-dù-tŭm* [2]	6. 368 binding-reeds, income of revenue(?),
7. *dup* 17 *lugal-igi-alim*	7. account 17 of Lugaligialim;
8. 600 × 4 + 60 × 8 + 54 *sa-gi en-dù-tŭm*	8. 2934 binding-reeds, income of revenue(?),
9. *dup* 25 *ni-kal-la*	9. account 25 of Nikalla;
10. 60 × 8 + 5 *sa-gi še-ta šám-a*	10. 485 binding-reeds bought with grain,
11. *dup* 7 *ur-dun*	11. account 7 of Urdun;
12. 60 × 4 + 20 *sa-gi še-ta šám-a*	12. 260 binding-reeds bought with grain,
13. 600 + 60 × 3 + 45 *sa-gi en-dù-tŭm*	13. 825 binding-reeds, income of revenue(?),
14. *dup* 12 *lù-gù-ni*	14. account 12 of Luguni
15. 60 × 3 + 52 *sa-gi še-ta šám-a*	15. 232 binding-reeds bought with grain,
16. 60 × 4 + 40 *sa-gi en-dù-t*[*ŭm*]	16. 280 binding-reeds, income of revenue(?),

Reverse

1. *dup* 7 *lù-*^{d}*en-lil-l*[*á*]	1. account 7 of Lu-Enlil;
2. 60 × 2 + 30 *sa-gi en-dù-tŭm*	2. 150 binding-reeds, income of revenue(?),
3. 50 *sa-gi še-ta šám-a*	3. 50 binding-reeds bought with grain,
4. *dup* 5 *a-gu*	4. account 5 of Agu;
5. 600 + 60 × 5 *sa-gi en-dù-tŭm*	5. 900 binding-reeds, income of revenue(?),
6. 3600 × 4 + 50 *sa-gi še-ta šám-a*	6. 14450 binding-reeds bought with grain
7. *dup lù-ŭr-sàg-ga*	7. account of Luurshagga;
8. 60 × 3 + 20 *sa-gi še-ta šám-a*	8. 200 binding-reeds bought with grain,

[2] The phrase *en-dù-tŭm* is not clear. *En-dù* in YBC, IV, 66 is a proper name borne by a scribe. It cannot, however, be taken as a proper name in our passage, but is clearly a phrase which denotes some other method of acquisition than purchase by an outlay of grain. The sign *dù* has as one of its ideographic significations *paḫu*, "control," "command," and *tŭm* (which might also be read *gin*) means to "bring." The whole, then, in connection with *en* seems to refer to income from rent or taxes or tribute.

9. *dup lù-^{d}ingir-ra*	9. account of Ludingir;
10. 10 *sa-gi en-dù-tŭm*	10. 10 binding-reeds, income of revenue(?),
11. *dup lù-^{d}nin-šaḫ*	11. account of Lu-Ninshakh,
12. 60 × 2 *sa-gi še-ta sám-a*	12. 120 binding-reeds bought with grain,
13. *dup pa-te-si-ka*	13. account of the Patesi,
14. 20 *sa-gi še-ta šám-a*	14. 20 binding-reeds bought with grain
15. *dup ur-^{d}ma-mi*	15. account of Ur-Mami.
16. *šu-nigin* 3600 × 7 + 600 × 4 + 60 × 7 + 58 *sa-gi še-ta šám-a*	16. Total 28078 reeds bought with grain;
17. *šu-nigin* 3600 + 600 × 3 + 67 *sa-gi en-dù-tŭm*	17. 5467 binding-reeds, income of revenue(?);
18. *ki-šes-kal-la-ta*	18. from Sheskalla
19. *lù-ŭr-šàg-ga ba-an-dib*	19. Lurshagga received;
20. *itu-bal-a ud* 15-*ta ud* 25-*šù*	20. month Bala, from the 15th day to the 25th day,
21. *mu na-maḫ ba-rú*	21. the year Namakh was built.

Namakh was built in the sixth year of Gimil-sin. The month Bala, the month of Inundation, was not so called in the calendars of Lagash. As the Tigris begins to rise in March it does not seem improbable that Bala was the name at Umma of the month še-kin-kud, Feb.-March.

The other tablet published by de Genouillac reads as follows:[3]

i, 1. 3600 *sa-gi-tû*	i, 1. 3600 split binding reeds,
2. 3600 + 600 × 5 *sa-gi gibil*	2. 6600 new binding reeds,
3. *à apin giš-ni-ka ù eš-gal-dū*	3. stock of the farmers Gishnika and Eshkhaldu;
4. 10 *gú esir apin*	4. 10 talents of prepared bitumen,
5. 30 *gú esir-sun-sun*	5. 30 talents of wet bitumen
6. *ki ur-dumu-ta*	6. from Ur-Dumu(zi),
7. *mu bád ba-rú*	7. the year the wall was built.
8. 1 *mà* 5 *gur*	8. 1 boat-load of 5 gur
9. *ki lugal-ezin-ta*	9. from Lugalezin;
10. 600 × 2 + 60 × 5 + 30 *sa-gi gibil gu-giš-ba* 16 *sa-ta*	10. 1530 new binding reeds (their wood-threads are 16 to a binder,[4]
11. 2½ mú-lil	11. 2½ are bright green)

[3] See de Genouillac, *Textes économiques d'Oumma de l'époque d'Our*, Paris, 1922, pl. XXXVIII, no. 6049.

[4] This apparently means that it took 16 of these reeds as a "bind" for a wall.

12. 5. *gil šàg-sig-gid-bi* 8⅔ *gar-ta*

13. *ki-lugal-unug-e-ta*
14. 600 × 2 + 60 × 5 + 30 *sa-gi gu-giš-ba* 16 *sa-ta*

15. 5. *gil šag-sig-gid-bi* 8⅔ *gar-ta*

16. 2⅔ *mú-lil*
17. *ki ur-ki-ama-ta*
18. *mu e-bā-ša-da-gan ba-ru*

12. 5 tablet-reeds at full length, 8⅔ (styli) to each
13. from Lugalunuge;
14. 1530 binding-reeds (their wood-threads are 16 to a binder),[4]
15. 5 tablet-reeds at full length, 8⅔ (styli) to each,
16. (2⅔ are bright green)
17. from Urkiama,
18. year the Ebasha (iš) of Dagan was built.

ii, 1. 46 *gú esir bar*

2. *esir* ^{d}*nin-mar-ka ra-ka*

3. *ki da-a-ga-ta*
4. *šunigin* 10 *gú esir-apin*

5. *šunigin* 30 *gú esir-sun-sun*

6. *šunigin* 46 *gu esir bar*

7. *šunigin* 1 *mà* 5 *gur*

8. *šunigin* 3600 *sa-gi-tû*
9. *šunigin* 3600 × 2 + 600 × 5 + 60 *sa-gi gibil*
10. *šunigin* 10 *gil šàg-sig-gid-bi* 8⅔ *gar-ta*

11. *šunigin* 5 *mú-lil*
12. *sag-nig-ga-ra-kam*
13. *šàg-bi-ta*
14. 3600 × 4 + 600 × 2 *sa-gi*
15. *dirig-pad šid-ag-iš zig-ga mu ê-bā-ša da-gan ba-rú*

16. 5 *mú-lil*
17. *udu kúr-ra ûr-ne*
18. *gìr šes-kal-la dumu na-di*

ii, 1. 46 talents of prepared bitumen,
2. (bitumen of the goddess Ninmar for waterwheels),
3. from Dāgata,
4. Total 10 talents of waterwheel bitumen;
5. total 30 talents of moist bitumen,
6. total 46 talents of prepared bitumen,
7. total 1 boat(load) of 5 gur, binding reeds.
8. total 3600 split
9. total 10260[5] new binding reeds,
10. total 10 tablet reeds at their full length (8⅔ styli to each),
11. total 5 bright green.
12. Sum of the stock received.
13. From it
14. 15600 binding reeds
15. in excess of office stock were given out the year the Ebasa(is) of Dagan was built.
16. 5 bright green
17. the mountain-sheep devoured.
18. Inspection-officer, Sheshkalla, son of Nadi.

[5] This total exceeds by 600 the number of new binding-reeds enumerated

iii,	1. 10 *gi-gil šàg-si(g)*	iii, 1. 10 tablet reeds in full (length),
	2. ½ *lal-an-ni gá-nig*	2. (the half length is on hand placed in the storehouse),
	3. *zig-ga-ám*	3. were given out.
	4. 10 *gú esir apin*	4. 10 talents of waterwheel bitumen,
	5. 30 *gú esir-sun-sun*	5. 30 talents of wet bitumen,
	6. 46 *gú esir bar*	6. 46 talents of prepared bitumen
	7. *lal-ni-ám*	7. are on hand.
	8. *dirig* 600 × 4 + 60 × 5 + 20 *sa-gi*	8. excess (or deficit), 2720 reeds.
iv,	1. *nig-šid-ag šàg-si*	iv, 1. Transaction of the business-office in the lane(?)
	2. *šàg a-gù-qak*	2. in Aguqa.
	3. *ur-du-gub-e* [*dup-šar*]	3. Urdugube, (scribe)
	4. *mu-us-sa ê-bā-ša da-gan ba-rú mu-us-sa-bi*	4. The year after the Ebasa(ish) of Dagan was built — the year after it.

In addition to the information about binding-reeds, that concerning bitumen is also interesting. There can, I think, be little doubt that *esir-sun-sun* is wet bitumen, or liquid bitumen which collects on the surface of the water at the bituminous springs.[6] The *esir apin* is either bitumen in its solid form, called by the Arabs *jîr*,[6] or the dry bitumen kneaded with the wet which the Arabs call *jîr*. As this last mentioned kind is used for caulking boats and water-wheels, and since *apin* originally represented a water-wheel, it is probable that *esir apin* was the prepared product now called *jîr*.[6] A number of other descriptive adjectives are applied to bitumen in other texts from the temple archives, but apparently all of them refer to the kinds of bitumen found in modern times. The bitumen described as *par* is several times definitely stated to be "for a house," i. e. for laying the founda-

in the preceding lines. One unit of six hundred has been accidentally omitted in col. i, 2 or i, 14. Whether the omission is due to the Babylonian scribe or to the modern copyist, it is impossible without access to the tablet to say.

[6] See Albright and Dougherty, *The Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 21, p. 21.

tions or the bricks.[7] In several instances it is said to have been loaded upon or carried by certain boats,[8] the names of which are given.[9] Two or three times it is said to be *a-ba-al*,[10] i. e. "drawn" or "dipped" from a well as in Gudea's Cylinder A, vi, 6. Once the well is said to be "sig-ga,"[11] "full"; and once *ḫur-sag*,[12] "the mountain well" or the well in a mountain. In one instance it is said to have been carried to the city Nina. The kinds of bitumen seem to have been the same, however, in ancient as in modern times.

[7] Reisner, *Tempel Urkunden aus Telloh*, 113, 121, v, xii, 122, vi.

[8] Cf. Allette de la Fuye, *Documents présargoniques*, nos. 344, 345, 346.

[9] The term *ú-aš* (DP, 346, iii), which seems at first to be a kind of bitumen, is shown by DP, 344, iii to be a part of the name of a boat, "Uash-Bau."

[10] DP, 345.

[11] *Inventaire de tablettes de Telloh*, II, 755. Ibid.

[12] Hussey, *Sumerian Tablets*, II, 150.

ON VEDIC DHÉNĀ, "PRAYER," "SONG"

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

CHANCING into a small article of mine, 'On the ἅπ. λεγ. *vīreṇyaḥ*, RV 10. 104. 10,'[1] I find that the stanza in question holds the much disputed word *dhénā*. Its first hemistich reads:

vīréṇyaḥ krátur índraḥ suśastír
utāpi dhénā puruhūtam īṭṭe.

For the impossible *vīréṇyaḥ krátur* I proposed the compound *váreṇyakratur*, assuming that the *ī* of *vīréṇyaḥ* is due to contamination with the closely synonymous *īḍényaḥ* (note the accents of the two words). Indeed, *váreṇyakratuḥ* and *īḍenyakratuḥ* are, as there pointed out, variants of one another in the same passage. Oldenberg, *RV Noten*, to 10. 104. 10, notwithstanding his well-known rather extreme aversion against emending the RV text accepts my proposal.

Yet my former pupil, Professor S. G. Oliphant, several years later, in his valuable article, "Sanskrit *dhenā* = Avestan *daēnā* = Lithuanian *dainà*," *JAOS* 32. 394 ff., translates, "Heroic strength and goodly praise is Indra;" and, similarly, Professor Hertel, *Die Arische Feuerlehre*, i. Teil (1925), p. 87, "Männliche Kraft (ist) Indra, der hochgelobte." Both scholars preserve the chimera *vīréṇya*, "as a noun at the head and a verbal adjective of necessity (gerundive) at the tail." My own translation of 10. 104. 10[ab] was, "Indra, of excellent understanding, deserves high praise, so then my song praises him that is called by many men." In a foot-note I identified *dhénā*, plural *dhénās*, with Lithuanian *dainà*, plural *daínos*, taking it for granted that Avestan *daēnā* is but a dialect form of the Vedic *dhénā*. Hillebrandt, *Lieder des Rig-Veda* (1913), p. 48, note 10, accepts the equation *dhénā* = *dainà*, but shrinks from drawing the consequences; Hertel, *l. c.*, regards the identity of *dhénā* with Avestan *daēnā* as basic, but does not mention Lith. *dainà*.

No less than four carefully elaborated treatments of *dhénā* have

[1] *The Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, 1906, nr. 10, pp. 1060 ff. (pp. 12 ff. of the reprint).

appeared within the twenty years or so that have elapsed since the publication of my little article on *vīrêṇyaḥ:* Geldner, *Ved. Stud.* iii. 35 ff.; Oldenberg, *Vedaforschung,* pp. 93 ff.; Oliphant, *JAOS* 32. 393 ff.; Hertel, *Die Arische Feuerlehre,* i. Teil, pp. 63 ff. Geldner, then fresher in his reliance on Sāyaṇa than now, says: "In this instance almost the entire lexical material is buried in Sāyaṇa. . . . *Dhenā* contains two or three quite different meanings which can scarcely be connected etymologically, still less lexically." Precisely the opposite seems to me true: *dhénā,* aside from slight shadings, is everywhere etymologically and lexically one and the same word, "prayer," "song." Oldenberg, accepting the Pet. Lex.'s explanation, "milchkuh," "milchtrank," shuts himself out of any real appreciation of the word. Oliphant, falling in with the ideas of my article on *vīrêṇya,* as well as other, verbal, utterances, is essentially correct, but misses some important aspects of the word, especially those of the dual *dhéne.* Hertel, in accordance with his very interesting cosmic fire theory, or perhaps rather, theory of heavenly light, renders *dhénā* by "himmelslicht," or the like, yet points out that it is often used in the sense of Vedic hymn (see, e. g., p. 87 bottom).

At the present time it may be possible to stabilize opinion at a few points, so as to reduce to a minimum the vexatious uncertainty from which the word has suffered over and beyond the degree justified by its intrinsic difficulty:

1. Any consideration of *dhénā* which leaves out of sight its dialectal sister, Avestan *daēnā,* is quite certain to go wrong. Hence it is not possible that *dhénā* means "flow," or "flowing substance." On the contrary, the word is related to *dhī,* "mind," "mental product," and, as regards meaning, to the numerous Vedic words which finally really mean "hymn": *gír, stóma, stutí, arkā́, manīṣā́, víp,* and many others. We must add to the Aryan pair Lithuanian *dainà* which means "song," probably, primarily, "religious song." This secures for the group I. E. antiquity, even tho the Lithuanian word may not help directly the philological specializations of the two Aryan words.[2] Geldner, *Der Rigveda,* to 1. 101. 10 (his latest utterance on the subject): "*dhenā* ist das, was milch (eigentlich

[2] The Lithuanists, curiously enough, seem not to have stumbled upon this etymology of dainà; see Bender, *A Lithuanian Etymological Index,* p. 30.

und figürlich) gibt, und der erguss (der milch oder des soma oder der rede) selbst." The only satisfactory words here are, "der rede," tacked on to "erguss." It is the fatal etymology from *dhe*, "suck," instead of from *dhī*, "think": Av. *daēnā*, or even the remote Lithuanian word could of itself have ensured the right decision.

2. The Śrāuta-texts[3] recite a list of 'wives of the gods,' announced in Vāit. by the expression, *devapatnīr vyācakṣva*, "tell the wives of the gods." The list contains the two adjacent statements, *senendrasya (patnī), dhenā bṛhaspateḥ (patnī)*, "Senā is the wife of Indra, Dhenā the wife of Bṛhaspati," meaning, "Missile (weapon) is the wife of Indra; Prayer the wife of Bṛhaspati." The passage is absolutely basic, and self-explanatory; it contains Hindu ideas which begin in the RV and last to the present moment of Hindu time. *Senā* is the embodiment of Indra's *imperium (kṣatra); Dhenā* the embodiment of Bṛhaspati's *sacerdotium (purohiti, pāurohitya)*.[4] There is here no possible discoloration of the meaning of *dhenā;* Oliphant, p. 411, quotes my oral statement that *dhénā* is the equivalent of *bṛhas* in *bṛhaspati*. Hertel, who urges his theory of "heavenly light," or "heavenly fire," for all Vedic words for "prayer," at many points realizes the identity of *dhénā* and *dhī* in the sense of "prayer"; see, e. g., p. 84, as compared with p. 166; indeed his cosmological theory of the origin of these words is often but a remote back-ground for their practical use both in Veda and Avesta. I would refer to his remark on p. 98, that Avestan *daēnā* is a synonym of Vedic *bráhman* which coincides, mathematically as it were, with my statement that Vedic *dhénā* is the equivalent of *bṛhas* in *bṛhaspati*. Cf. also Hertel's analyses on pp. 87, 94, 112, and his identification of *dhénābhiḥ* with *dhībhíḥ* on p. 84. Oldenberg, p. 94, translates, "Senā des Indra (gattin), Dhenā des Bṛhaspati (gattin)." It is much to be regretted that he does not explain *Dhenā* in that connection. Could he have been content with the intrinsically meaningless idea, that "Milchtrank" is the wife of Bṛhaspati? And would he have sacrificed to this the obvious antithesis involved (*imperium* and *sacerdotium*)? Surely

[3] See my Vedic Concordance, under *senendrasya*.

[4] Cf. the expressions, *bṛhaspatir vācām*, and *bṛhaspatir brāhmaṇaḥ* (sc. *adhipatiḥ*) in my *Concordance;* they, of themselves, establish the equation *dhénā* = *bráhman* (neuter).

the proportions, *indra: senā = bṛhaspati: x,* must be filled out by "prayer," and nothing else.

3. All Vedic words for "prayer" are intrinsically dualic; the complement of "prayer" is "libation," expressed countless times, implied hardly less often. Even Oliphant, who in the main sees eye to eye with me in these matters, as well as other interpreters, misses this point in RV 1. 141. 1, where occurs the word *sasrútaḥ:*

yád īm úpa hvárate sádhate matír
ṛtásya dhénā anayanta sasrútaḥ.

He translates the second pada, "The songs of *Ṛta* bring him as they flow." The translators, as well as the lexicographers, take *sasrútaḥ* as a reduplicated noun from the root *sru* "flow," a formation really too problematic to discuss. The word is a compound (*sa-srút*), meaning, "accompanied by oblations"; the pāda is to be translated, "the songs of *ṛta* (i. e., the pious or holy songs) together with (our) oblation bring him on." As an example of another pass, take Geldner's rendering, *Der Rigveda,* p. 178, "es holten (ihn) die fliessenden ergüsse (*dhénāḥ!*) der wahrheit her."[5] A perfect parallel to 1. 141. 1 is 9. 34. 6,

sám enam áhrutā imā́ gíro arṣanti sasrútaḥ,

"To him haste together, unerringly, these songs accompanied by libations." Is it really possible to question that *dhénāḥ* and *gíraḥ* in the two passages are one and the same thing, and that they appear with their natural ritualistic companions, here called *srut* (oblation)?

As might be expected *dhénā* occurs regularly, if not exclusively, in close junction with other words for "libation," or kindred ritualistic acts: 3. 1. 9, *vy àsya* dhárā *asṛjad ví* dhénāḥ, for which see Oliphant's discussion, p. 407; 10. 104. 3, *prógrā́m pītím vṛṣṇa iyarmi . . .* sutásya . . . *índra* dhénābhir *iha mādayasva;* 4. 58. 6, *samyák sravanti saríto ná* dhénāḥ . . . *eté arṣanty ūrmáyo* ghṛtásya; 7. 94. 4, *índre agnā́ námo bṛhát* suvṛktím *érayāmahe* (*suvṛktím* refers to the *barhis*) *dhiyā́* dhénā *avasyávaḥ;* 1. 2. 3, *váyo táva prapṛñcatī* dhénā *jigāti dāśúṣe, urúcī* sómapītaye; 10. 43. 6, *jánānā́m*

[5] Similarly, and very emfatically, in his mis-rendering of *sasrútaḥ*, Oldenberg, p. 97. Ludwig (284), no better, "mit der heiligen ordnung strömend brachten ihn die lieder," where the genitive *ṛtásya* is handled very badly.

dhénā *avacākaśad vṛṣā, yásyāha śakráḥ* sávaneṣu *ráṇyati;* 7. 24. 2, *víṣṛṣṭa*dhenā *bharate* suvṛktíḥ (again the *barhis*). These dualic expressions are on all fours with the simply countless pairs, such as, *dhītáyaḥ* and *dhárayā* in 8. 6. 8; *girā* and *dhárayā* in 9. 10. 4; *dhiyā* (*matī*) and *dhárayā* in 9. 44. 2, not to mention commonplaces, such as *námobhir havíṣā* (5. 28. 1); or *yajñébhir gīrbhíḥ* (6. 2. 2).

4. The preceding consideration brings us to the real crux of the matter, namely, two occurrences of the dualic *dhéne,* 1. 101. 10; 5. 30. 9. These have invariably caused a sort of *bouleversement* at the end of each interpreter's exposition. Geldner, p. 39, following Sāyaṇa's lead, translates *ví sṛjasva dhéne* in 1. 101. 10 by "loosen your tongue (to drink)," but this dualic tongue in the end, is too much for him, so that in his RV translation, p. 119, he has, "lass beide brüste dir strömen," which has no better foundation. Oldenberg, p. 99, not too enthusiastically, thinks of soma and water. Hertel, p. 91, "giesse dir die beiden himmelsfeuer (i. e. soma and milk) ein." Oliphant, p. 406, holds hard to "two voices," but is put to it to find them: "that of (Indra's) gracious commendation of his worshipper's praises, and that terrifying, thundering battle shout." Or, as an alternative, "we may consider the two *dhénā* as the gracious, approving song of Indra, and the Maruts' song of praise."

It seems to me that a well-established habit of the earlier language places the dual *dhéne* not far away from the sfere in which our brief analysis has located the singular and plural. I mean that *dhéne* is elliptic dual (*dvaṁdva ekaśeṣa*), meaning, "song and libation." The two things are not only close partners in practice, but are held together by the constant idea that both flow, a point very well brought out in Oliphant's investigation. We shall have to accustom ourselves to the not too curious idea that prayers (like oblations) flow from the worshipper into the god whom he worships, and that both contribute to the god's power. In 1. 101. 10,

ví ṣyasva śípre ví sṛjasva dhéne,

"Open thy lips; take in song and libation," are blended dualistically the ideas that are expressed separately in 3. 1. 9, *vy àsya dhárā asṛjad ví dhénāḥ* (cf. *víṣṛṣṭadhenā* in 7. 24. 2), in which *dhárāḥ* and *dhénāḥ* analyze mechanically the two component parts

of the elliptic dual *dhéne*. In 1. 101. 10, both "flow" into Indra's capacious maw, according to a conception expressly stated, and, after all, natural enough. In 5. 30. 9 the expression *ubhé asya dhéne* (rendered more familiar and emfatic by the use of *ubhé* with the elliptic dual)[6] again, and perhaps more clearly, refers to hymn and libation which encourage Indra in his demon fights:

stríyo hí dāsá áyudhāni cakré
kím mā karann abalá asya sénāḥ,
antár hy ákhyad ubhé asya dhéne
áthópa prāíd yudháye dásyum índraḥ

"The demon (Namuci) made his women his weapons: what can they do to me? His missiles (or armies) are feeble! Indra looked upon (considered) both the songs and libations within (him), and then went forth to fight the demon." That is to say, Indra gathers courage for the demon fight from the hymns and soma libations of his worshippers, both of which are supposed to flow into him.[7] As compared with all the divergent guesses, for some of which Father Sāyaṇa is directly responsible, it seems scarcely possible to question this natural, grammatical interpretation of *dhéne*. The word for "oblation," implied in the elliptic *dhéne* is, most likely, *dhárā*, which figures frequently by the side of *dhénā*.

If any scholar should think the elliptic dual *dhéne* rather unexpected, I would remind him of the solitary *śabálāu* in RV 10. 14. 10, which I had long ago interpreted as an elliptic dual = to the ordinary singulars *śabala* and *śyāma* (*śyāva*), which do not occur in the RV at all, yet are the old established names of the two dogs of Yama; see my *Cerberus, The Dog of Hades* (Chicago, 1905), pp. 31 ff.[8] A single time, this interesting speech habit of the Veda finds here its opportunity, tho the ordinary analytic statement, *śabala* and *śyāma*, would certainly have been clearer as well as more picturesque.

---

[6] Cf., e. g., *ubhé dyāvā*, "both heaven and earth," 9. 70. 2.

[7] In close parallel with the expression *ví srjasva dhéne* in 1. 101. 10, which means, "Take in song and libation."

[8] Of course *śabálāu* is to be translated "the speckled and the dark," not, "the two speckled"; the former is the Hindu tradition, including the Buddhist tradition clear down to Divyāvadāna, p. 9, l. 20. See as an example Rouse's translation of Jātaka 544 (p. 124 in Vol. VI of the Cambridge Translation).

BRIEF NOTES

Dravidian notes

Kanara *bāj,* later *bāji,* Tamil *vāj,* Tulu *bāji,* Brâhui *bā,* Kurukh *bai* (mouth).

In Tamil and early Kanara a word may end in one of the vowel-like consonants. Modern Kanara adds *i* after *j* (consonant-*i*), and *u* after other sounds; similar changes are found in spoken Tamil.

Final *s* has become *i* in Tamil *talai* (head) corresponding to Dardic *thōs* < **tlaos* < **talos* (JAOS 1926:46.177). Kanara has *kai* = Tamil *kai* (hand), beside *tale* = Tamil *talai,* with the regular contraction of weak-strest *ai* to *e*. The word *kai* is now generally sounded *kei* in Kanara; Kittel's dictionary writes it as *kej,* showing that the difference between *i* and *j* is not very great. From the pronunciation of Tamil *cejdu* (having done) as *çeidï* (*Maître phonétique* 1913: 28.121), it appears that the *j* of *vāj* may be the same as the *i* of *kai.* It is therefore reasonable to assume **wās* as the basis of *vāj* and its formal equivalents.

In spoken southern Dravidian a *v* is commonly prefixt to the isolated form of a word beginning, as written, with an *o*-sound. Kittel's dictionary tells us that Kanara often changes initial *o* and *ō* to *vo, vō,* or even to *va, vā.* Telugu has *vaka* as a variant of *oka* (one); Gôndi *var* (alone) is evidently the same word as Kanara *oru,* Tamil *oru* (one). If the tendency to alter initial *o*-sounds existed in preliterary Dravidian, the word **wās* may have come from Aryan **ōs* (= Latin *ōs,* Sanskrit *ās*). The native word was **znoro.*

Telugu *nōru,* Gôndi **sōr,* Brâhui **dōr,* Malto *toro,* Kui *sudā* (mouth).

Among the derivatives of **znoro,* a lost Brâhui **dōr* seems to be implied by Dardic *dōr* (JAOS 1926:46.177); Gôndi keeps the corresponding word-form in the compound *mus-sōr* (nose).

The sound-system of Dravidian agrees with Indoeuropean in possessing short *e* and short *o*. But in southern Dravidian and in some of the northern tongues these sounds have disappeared from non-initial syllables, tho a new weak *e* has been widely developt from *ai;* thus the *o* of **talos* changed to *u* in Kui *tlau,* to *a* in

Gôndi and southern **talas*. This indicates that the position of main stress at the beginning of a word, as it is in Kanara and Tamil, is an ancient feature of Dravidian. Stress-displacement is implied by the vowels of Gôndi *kurrā* (calf)= Tamil *kandru; malōl* (hare)= Kanara *molam; miār* (daughter)= Brâhui *masiṛ*, Kanara *magaḷ* (< **mawaḷ* < **masiḷ*); and by those of Kui *mrāu* < **mirāu* < **miāru* = Gôndi *miār*.

From Kui *luhā* (iron) with *u* for Aryan *o*, and *sirō* corresponding to Brâhui *dīr*, southern *nīr, nīru* (water), we should expect **surō* as the Kui derivative of **znoro*. The ending of *sudā* implies external influence. Beside *tomod* (mouth) in one of the Kolarian tongues, we find *to* in another (*Linguistic Survey of India* 4. 247), showing that *tomod* is a compound; the order of the elements is reverst in Malay *mulut* (mouth), in accord with the form of Malay *teliŋa* (ear)= Kolarian *lintir*, and *lima* (five)= Kolarian *manlēi, molloi, moloi*. If **moda* or **muda* was an older form of *-mod*, its influence would explain perfectly the ending of Kui *sudā*. In any case the *d* of *-mod* accounts for the Kui *d*.

Kanara *tuṭi*, Tamil *tuḍi*, Tulu *duḍi* (lip) ; Gôndi *ṭuḍḍī* (mouth).

From Gôndi *allī* = Kanara *ili*, Tamil *eli* (rat), and *talā* with the variant *tallā* = Tamil *talai*, Telugu *tala* (head), it seems clear that *ṭuḍḍī* is a formal equivalent of Tamil *tuḍi* : stress-displacement explains the long vowel and the doubled consonant. The basic form apparently had a medial *ṭ*, which was kept or restored in Kanara under the influence of the initial consonant. From the evidence for Gôndi **sōr*, we may assume that the sense of *ṭuḍḍī* is an alteration of 'lip.' There is nothing to justify Bloch's idea of separating *ṭuḍḍī* from *tuṭi* (*Bulletin de la Société de linguistique* 1924: 25. 18). The Dravidian words may represent the source of Singhalese *tol* (lip), for which Geiger assumes an unexplained basis **tuḍa* (*Litteratur und Sprache der Singhalesen* § 75).

Washington, D. C. EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

On the Vocalization of the Ideogram ŠES-AB^{ki}-MA

Although during the period of the last dynasty of Ur the above ideogram for the city of Ur is regularly written ŠES-AB^{ki} with or without -MA—a writing which occurs hundreds of times—the syllabary gives the writing as ŠES-UNU^{ki} (CT, XI, 49, 30). This

writing is also found in texts as old as the Larsa dynasty (cf. Poebel, UMBS, V, no. 2, cols. i and ii; no. 34, cols. iii and xix). The writing ŠES-AB^{ki} was therefore obtained by omitting the three double wedges from the midst of UNU. Doubtless the pronunciation was not changed. The MA is clearly a phonetic complement. UNU, then, became UN, and afterward UM. SES has also the value URU (S^{b}, V, 12). Doubtless, therefore, the ideogram was read URU-UM^{ki}-MA. The ideogram was thus a Sumerian phonetic spelling of the name of the city of Ur. These facts give a new phonetic value to the sign ÊŠU. Along with the values *eš* and *ab*, we now have *um*.[1]

GEORGE A. BARTON.

University of Pennsylvania.

Identification of Sign No. 572 of Barton's Babylonian Writing

This sign,  , occurs three times in inscriptions of Ur-Nina, usually preceded by the sign  . When making the book on the Babylonian Writing, I had taken the for "water" and had tentatively identified this sign with KA, "gate," supposing the water to represent in these passages "canal," because the combination is twice followed by *mu-dun*, a verb which is equivalent to the Semitic *ḫaru*, "dig," and which is employed by other kings of Lagash to express the digging of canals. Deimel had since conjectured that the sign pictured a female body plus clothes,[1] and that a later form of it occurs in a text of the Ur dynasty published by Clay.[2]

In re-reading the early royal inscriptions during the present academic year, I have been convinced of the correctness of Deimel's identification of the form, and have, I think, been able to determine that it represented a female statue of a goddess or queen, and was probably pronounced *alan*, and that just as TUR = *ḫâru*, "dig," is

[1] After this note left my hands I noticed that the reading proposed above was adopted by Radau in 1900. See his *Early Babylonian History*, 415 and passim.

[1] *Liste der archaischen Keilschriftzeichen von Fara* no. 175 and *Orientalia*, no. 14 p. 47.

[2] YBC, no. 12, iii, 13.

used for carving a statue, so DUN = *ḫâru* refers in these passages to carving a statue. Thus in Dec. XXXVI, no. 3 in the first three columns we read: *ᵈnina-ur lugal šir-pur-la dumu gu-ni-du dumu gur-šar ê-ᵈnina mu-rú ᵈnina mu-tu(r) a-alan mu-dun ᵈnina alan a-mu-nisag-na èš-ir mu-tu(r)*; i. e. "Ur-Nina, king of Lagash, son of Gunidu, son of Gurshar, the temple of Nina built, the goddess Nina he caused to enter in. A statue he carved. The goddess Nina, the statue, at the beginning of the year into the house he caused to enter." In an unpublished tablet of Ur-Nina, of which Thureau-Dangin kindly sent me a squeeze some years ago, the sign occurs as the statue of a goddess, where it is mentioned in connection with the carving of a *gal-uš*, "giant man," as the statue of a god.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

University of Pennsylvania.

A Stone Group of Amset and Hapi

The accompanying cut represents a unique group of two of the sons of Horus or Osiris, Amset and Hapi. The stone is in the possession of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnology of the University of California. Made of black diorite, it measures 485 mm in height and 340 mm in width. Amset, as usual, is represented in the likeness of a man, while Hapi bears the head of a pavian.

The inscription on top of the base reads:

'May they watch over the fourth prophet of Amon, Mont-em-ḥet, who may shine like Rê'.'

Concerning the representation of lizards and serpents in the hands of Amset and Hapi I searched in vain among published material. Professor G. Roeder of Hildesheim, however, called my attention to such representations on the interior coffin of Berlin 11982 (comp. *Aegyptische Inschriften des Berliner Museums*, Leipzig, 1924, Band 2, pages 385-387). It contains representations of demons, among them on the inner bottom:

(1) An enthroned god (mummy-body) with the head of a pavian, who holds a winding serpent in his hand. In the



A Stone Group of Amset and Hapi.

confused inscription above him appears the name Amset; the inscriptions and the hieroglyphs, however, are so corrupted and disarranged that not much value attaches to them.

(2) Opposite Amset is another god (mummy-body) with human head, holding a lizard in front of him.

On the interior coffin walls the four gods Amset, Hapi, Qebeḥ-senuf and Duamutef are once more represented. Three of them hold the scourge in their hands (mummy-body), but the pavian-headed god holds a lizard.

H. F. Lutz.

University of California.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Israel and Babylon. By W. LANSDELL WARDLE, M. A., D. D., Tutor in Hartley College, Manchester; sometime Scholar of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. New York and Chicago: FLEMING H. REVELL, 1925. Pp. xvi + 344. Price $3.75.

This is a sane and fresh discussion of the relations of Israel and Babylon, and the possible indebtedness of the former to the latter. The substance of the work formed the twenty-fifth Hartley Lecture. We may be grateful to the foundation of this lectureship for calling into being such a well-balanced book. The author discusses briefly the inter-relations of Palestine, Egypt, and Babylonia, Israel's ancestors, outlines the main features of Babylonian religion, discusses the origins of Hebrew monotheism (rightly concluding that it was derived neither from Egypt nor from Babylonia), then he discusses the Creation stories, Paradise and the Fall, the Antedeluvians, the Deluge, the Sabbath and Yahweh, legislation, and Pan-Babylonianism and Clay's Amurru theory. On the whole Dr. Wardle's conclusions are those which well-balanced scholarship would accept. He rightly and positively rejects the pan-Babylonian theory; the one defect of his book is that he does not as positively reject the Amurru theory. True, he has too much scholarly feeling to accept all the arguments by which the Amorite origin of the Creation story has been maintained (pp. 146-150), but still he feels that, though the Amurru-theory has not been demonstrated "in some such direction as this the true solution of the problem is to be sought" (p. 330). The reviewer has no desire to repeat the demonstration of the unhistorical character of the Amurru theory already published in the pages of this JOURNAL. The Amurru theory, in the form in which it has been advocated, has no more foundation than the Pan-Babylonian theory. Meantime the decipherment of the Mitannian and Hittite inscriptions and the discoveries of Dr. Chiera at Kirkuk are introducing us to an undreamed-of factor in the problem—the Hurri—the people of Harran—a fuller knowledge of whom promises to show that they had a profound influence in Palestine and Israel.

Oxford Edition of Cuneiform Inscriptions. Edited under the direction of S. LANGDON, Professor of Assyriology at Oxford: Vol. I, *The H. Weld-Blundell Collection in the Ashmolean Museum: Sumerian and Semitic Religious and Historical Texts;* pp. iv + 60 + 45 plates. Vol. II, *Historical Inscriptions, containing principally the Chronological Prism, W-B, 444;* pp. iv + 36 + 7 plates. Oxford: UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1923.

Oxford University is to be congratulated upon the inception of this important series of cuneiform texts under the energetic editorship of Professor Langdon, and the world of scholarship is likewise to be congratulated upon the publication of so much important material. Volume I contains twenty-two texts, partly historical and partly religious. The historical texts range in time from an inscription of the wife of Rim-Sin to an inscription of Hammurabi, a brick stamp of Shulmanu-asharidu son of Ashurnasirpal, a barrel cylinder of Nabonidus and include a clay cone of Samsuiluna, a brick stamp of Ashurbanipal, an inscribed brick of Ashuretililani, and one of Nebuchadnezzar. The religious texts include a hymn from Eridu, a legend from Erech, a composition dedicated to the god Sin, a hymn to Nidaba, hymns to the deified Babylonian rulers, Dungi and Enlilbani, as well as an incantation. There is in addition an important liturgy of the pre-historic city of Kesh.

Volume II contains but four texts, but they are important ones. The first is a list of Babylonian ante-diluvian and historical kings down to the dynasty of Isin. It is inscribed on a four-sided clay prism, two columns being written on each side. The text is a parallel to the similar list from Nippur published by Poebel, though it presents many variations. It fills many gaps left by the fragmentary condition of the Nippur tablet, and contains the names of the ante-diluvian kings, which had been broken away from Poebel's text. This text alone is worth the volume. Another text, somewhat defaced, contains the Babylonian kings before the flood; another, a fragment of a chronicle of the events in each year of the reign of Hammurabi; and the last is a well preserved text of Sin-iddinam. Each volume has an introduction and contains transliterations and translations of the most important texts.

The work exhibits Professor Langdon's wide knowledge, but his

proofs were not carefully read. For example, to mention but two of the instances noted, in Vol. I, p. 21, l. 20 the name of Rim-Sin is transliterated *^{d}Ri-im-^{d}Zu-en*, whereas the original, pl. 17, shows the regular form *$^{i\,l}$Ri-im-^{d}En-zu*. In the very next line of the same text we find *dun-giš-tug ^{d}En-lil-lá*, translated "the valiant, who obeys Enlil," whereas instead of *^{d}En-lil-lá* the cuneiform has *^{d}En-zu*. It is necessary to control the transliterations by the originals. Due doubtless to the same careless proof-reading is the fact that the plates of Vol. I bear Arabic numerals and those of Vol. II, Roman numerals.

A Sumerian Reading Book. By C. J. GADD, M. A., Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities, the British Museum. Oxford: at the CLARENDON PRESS, 1924. Pp. viii + 198. Price $3.

Mr. Gadd merits the gratitude of English-speaking scholars for the preparation of this admirable book for beginners in Sumerian. He modestly calls it a "Reading-book," but it is really a complete beginning book in Sumerian, containing a sign-list, brief outline of the grammar, admirably selected extracts for reading, given both in the original cuneiform and in transliteration, and a vocabulary. The work is well and carefully done and is well arranged. Some points in Sumerian grammar are still debatable, and, while Gadd has followed the authorities most in vogue now, one may sometimes differ from him. Nevertheless the book is one to be heartily recommended.

The Fall of Nineveh, the newly discovered Babylonian Chronicle. No. 21,901, in the British Museum, edited with Translation, Notes, etc. By C. J. GADD, M. A., Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities, British Museum. Oxford: UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1923. Pp. x + 42, six plates. Price 4 shillings.

The Fall of Nineveh. By C. J. GADD. Reprinted from the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XI. Oxford: UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1923. Pp. 6. Price 35 cts.

The chronicle published by Mr. Gadd filled an important gap in our knowledge of the fall of the Assyrian empire. Before its publication we had been compelled to rely mainly on the conflicting statements of Herodotus and Diodorus, and the date of Nineveh's actual fall was a matter of inference. This Chronicle, which is well edited by Mr. Gadd in the first of the two works listed, and the significance of which is briefly discussed in the second of them, supplies many important details and puts some things in quite unexpected perspective. It confirms the Greek tradition that the Medes had a hand in the overthrow of Assyria, and, being written by a Babylonian, does not, perhaps, give them full credit for their part in it. It shows us the steps which led up to the destruction of Nineveh in 612 B. C., but reveals the fact that four years before that the Assyrian king had fled to Harran, which he fortified, and that there he held out for two years after that. Since the publication of this chronicle three years ago, scholars have shown their deep appreciation of Gadd's contribution to our knowledge by their eager discussion of the new material here presented.

Ninive und Babylon. Von Prof. Dr. C. BEZOLD. Vierte Auflage bearbeitet von Prof. Dr. C. FRANK. Mit 160 Abbildungen, darunter 6 mehrfarbigen Tafeln. Bielefeld und Leipzig: Verlag von VELHAGEN & KLASING, 1926. Pp. vi + 180.

The value of Professor Bezold's *Ninive und Babylon,* which forms one of the series of "Monographien zur Weltgeschichte" is shown by the fact that it has now reached a fourth edition. This edition, prepared by the competent hands of Professor Frank, is thoroughly up to date and puts the work in a form to continue its useful service. Dr. Frank portrays the recently excavated ziggurat at Ur and the copper friezes from Tell-Obeid. The book is well printed and the illustrations are well chosen and well executed.

Babylonian Life and History. By Sir E. A. WALLIS BUDGE, M. A., Litt. D. New York and Chicago: FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY, 1925. Pp. xxii + 296. Price $3.75.

In 1883 Dr. Budge published a book under the above title in the series of "By-Paths of Bible Knowledge"; many reprints of this edition were made as the book had a long and continuous sale. In the stress of the war the lead plates on which it had been stereotyped were requisitioned by the British government and melted up for bullets. When asked to revise the old work to be reprinted, Dr. Budge found that so much new material had come to light in the more than forty years that had elapsed since the first publication, that it was necessary to entirely rewrite the book: the volume under consideration is the result. It contains accounts, written in Dr. Budge's well-known readable style, of the country and its rivers, a sketch of Babylonian chronology and history, an account of the Babylonian stories of the Creation and Flood, a sketch of Babylonian religious beliefs, of the Code of Hammurabi, of the Babylonian religious and magical literature, of the relation of the king of Babylon to his people, of Babylonian writing and learning, and closes with an account of the recent excavations by Thompson, Hall, and Woolley at Eridu and Ur, and of Mackay at Kish. As always in his books, Dr. Budge mingles with his descriptions liberal sprinklings of the script of the country about which he is speaking, so that the reader is given something of a feeling for the originals to which he is being introduced. The work contains thirty-two excellent illustrations. It will, we trust, be read by many.

University of Pennsylvania. GEORGE A. BARTON.

The Phonetics of Arabic. A Phonetic Inquiry and Practical Manual for the Pronunciation of Classical Arabic and of one Colloquial (the Egyptian). By W. H. T. GAIRDNER. Oxford University Press, 1925.

Canon Gairdner is well fitted by his scholarship, his musical training, and his long residence in Cairo, to perform this task. His critical phonetic observation extends over the last fifteen years or more, during which he has mastered the method of the modern-

language phoneticians and successfully applied it to Arabic. On the other hand, residence in Cairo, with only occasional visits to England, have deprived him of a full acquaintance with the literature of phonetics; and his contacts appear to have been rather with the school which does not emphasize laboratory work. It may be said at once, however, that this book is the only attempt of the kind, and a very successful one, both as a scientific treatise and a school text-book. It ought to have a wide circulation among orientalists and philologists, as well as among practical people with interests in Arab lands.

It is unfortunate that the symbol *ʃ* is employed for ج throughout the book (pp. 14, 24). It signifies properly the true palatal which "sometimes sounds to the ear like *dy*, sometimes like *gy*" (p. 23), and which is heard only in "Upper Egypt and the Sudan" (p. 12). The correct symbol for ج is given on p. 23, line 7 from below: *d* with a long *z*, representing the first sound in English *jam*. It has been suggested before, somewhere, that all the values of ج arose from *ʃ*; but the extreme rarity of the change *ʃ* to *g* (personally I know of no instance), and the great frequency of the opposite, would argue against such an assumption, even if we did not have *g* in Hebrew and other older Semitic languages. The *g* of Cairene Arabic remains, I think, a primitive feature from some corner of Arabia; and certainly it is not (as some think) the result of Boheiric Coptic.

On p. 12 the *z*-pronunciation of ظ is said to be heard "only in the colloquials," but on p. 21 "even in speaking classical." The latter is true.

If the pressure-articulation (*Vox*, 1914, pp. 82 ff.; *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenensprachen*, Vol. xi, pp. 81 ff.) had been described once for all, it would have been easy to explain ج and غ (pressure-whisper and pressure-tone), and then all the "emphatics," which are only ordinary sounds accompanied by, and regularly distorted by, the pressure-articulation in its last stage: a raising of the tongue which velarizes and alveolarizes the sound, and which gives the *subjective* feeling of "emphasis." The writer very nearly comes to this on p. 20. The central figure opposite p. 17 clearly shows the muscular tension attending ص. The lateral ض (p. 20, note 4) of Arab tradition I cannot imagine. If it is not a fiction,

it must be some peculiar development of the older pressure-articulation which Meinhof (*loc. cit.*) has shown to have existed in old Hebrew. The x-ray photographs used by *Vox* (*loc. cit.*) show that ح (and probably ع) are made by elevation of the larynx and constriction of the pharynx (swallowing motion), and *not* by "the false vocal chords" (p. 27). This sound is regularly made when blowing upon the hands in cold weather, and may be so taught (p. 27).

On p. 12 the velarized *l* is said to occur "only (normally) in the name for 'God'"; but on p. 19 it is correctly said to occur frequently "in words where *l* is influenced by neighboring velarized consonants." I doubt that either *l* is anything but the natural lateral, related to one or the other of the *t*-articulations. The unvoicing of *l* (p. 19) and *r* (p. 22) must not be carried so far as in French, nor the unvoicing of *b* so far as in German, Turkish, or Armenian.

True, the غ must be pronounced without any "scrape" or actual vibration of the uvula (p. 26), but so also its voiceless counterpart, خ, for the reason that neither is far enough back for that. Both are velar, not uvular.

The *h* has long been identified with the groan; and, if this is right, it is made with the cartilage glottis, not with "a larger quantity of air than is necessary for voice only" (p. 29).

The chapters on the influence of consonants on vowels (Ch. vii) and upon each other (Ch. viii) are unique and valuable.

Absence of traditional rules for accenting classical Arabic, as well as the modern practice of Coran reading, point to an ancient system in which quantity alone was important, at least in recitation, and in which accent (pitch and stress) were freely at the disposition of taste and emotion, as is the case to some extent in French.

P. 21, line 4 from below: read *are*.

W. H. Worrell.

University Library,
Ann Arbor, Mich.

Kitāb Khiṭaṭ al-Shām. By MUHAMMAD KURD-'ALI. Damascus, 1925. 3 Vols. Pp. 309, 317, 271.

This is undoubtedly the most notable piece of work produced by the Arabic press of Syria in the course of last year. The author, who is the president of the Arab Academy in Damascus and an ex-minister of education in the post-war Syrian government, spent twenty-five years, as he tells us in the introduction (vol. I: 10), collecting his material, and visited Europe three times (I: 6) ransacking its manuscript collections and libraries.

In the composition of his work, Mr. Kurd-'Ali has consciously followed the example of al-Maḳrizi (died 1442 A. D.) in his *Khiṭaṭ*, and tried to produce a history of that country where perhaps more history has been made than in any other country of equal size but which has remained until the present time without a written consecutive history—Syria. What he turned out was more a piecemeal compilation of historical data from varying, and sometimes contradictory, sources; thus making accessible to the Arabic reading public material which is not always ready at hand.

Volume I begins with a list of 695 authorities, one hundred of which are European, from which the author drew his facts. The list is neither alphabetically arranged nor critically chosen. The fantastic Waḳidi's *Futūḥ al-Shām* (which is in reality a pseudo-Waḳidi) stands not far from the highly judicious Baladhuri's *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, and the uncritical Sédillot's *Histoire générale des Arabes* stands side by side with the scholarly contributions of Père Lammens. Michaud's antiquated works on the Crusades are listed before the scientific works of Berchem. For the monumental works of Wellhausen in German and Caetani in Italian, one would search in vain in this long list.

The first volume takes up the racial origins of the people of Syria, the languages they spoke at different periods, the history of the country in pre-Islamic times, the Arab conquest, the Umayyad period, the Abbasid and the Fatimite rule, and the first Crusade. In some cases the authorities are quoted verbatim without reference to volume and page (I: 63, 66, 95), and in others the sources are paraphrased (I: 65, 74, 75). It is clear from this volume that the bias of the author is all on the side of the Arabs. Writing as he did in the ancient capital of the Umayyads while seething with

revolutionary spirit against French rule, he tries at the end of certain chapters (I: 84, 86, 131) to preach nationalistic sermons. His enthusiasm for the Arab rule makes him paint the Roman period in Syria (I: 101-102) in darker colors than the facts warrant, and makes him plant the Umayyad banner in Pekin (I: 161)!

Volume II begins with the Nuri Dynasty in Syria and ends with the beginning of the thirteenth century A. H. It covers the crusading and Mamluk periods together with the first three centuries of the Ottoman rule. It is clear that the author has no Turkish sympathies. His knowledge of the Turkish sources serves him well in this period. On the controversial question of the transference of the caliphate from the last Abbasid claimant to the Ottoman Selim, or to his son Suleiman, he is, however, silent.

In the third volume which deals with the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Mr. Kurd-'Ali makes his real contribution. Here he is not only a chronicler, a compiler, but a historian. His material is well digested and lucidly reproduced. His ability to handle Turkish sources, his relations with the governors of Damascus, the part he himself played during the war and in the Feisal régime all come to illuminate many important episodes. Here he preserves many of the oral traditions and local points of view (III: 139, 149, 167, 177). Although in some places he is not critical as when he writes (III: 185), "It is said that President Wilson had in mind giving the mandate over Syria to the Argentine Republic and over Palestine to Portugal," yet on the whole this volume is well documented and supplied with the author's own ideas and interpretations which undoubtedly represent the viewpoint of the moderate Muslim *intelligentsia* of Syria.

Mr. Kurd-'Ali promises three more volumes dealing especially with the social and civic life of the country, and we hope that they will be supplied with complete indices, maps and illustrations which the first three volumes lack. The volumes will undoubtedly be printed in the same beautiful type and form as the preceding three which are modelled after the Journal of the Arab Academy.

PHILIP K. HITTI.

Princeton University.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Acta Orientalia. Ediderunt Societates Orientales Batava, Danica, Norvegica. Vol. IV, Pars IV. Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1926.

Adatrechtbundels. Bezorgd door de commissie voor het adatrecht en uitgegevan door het koninklijk instituut voor de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië. XXIV: Groote Oost. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1925.

The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research. Vol. V for 1923-1924. Edited by Benjamin W. Bacon. New Haven: 1925.

Archiv für Orientforschung. Vol. III, Part I. Berlin: 1926.

Baikoff, N. A. The Manchurian Tiger. Harbin: Manchuria Research Society, 1925.

Ball, V. Travels in India by Jean-Baptiste Tavernier. Two Volumes. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1925.

Barua (B.) and Sinha (K. G.). Barhut Inscriptions, edited and translated with critical notes. Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1926. Pp. x + 141.

Basset, René. Mille et un Contes, Récits & Legendes Arabes. Vol. II. Contes sur les Femmes et l'Amour, Contes Divers. Paris: Maisonneuve Frères, 1926.

Bhagavadajjukīyam, a Prahasana of Bodhāyana Kavi, with commentary. Edited with critical notes and introduction by P. Anujan Achan; with a preface by Professor M. Winternitz. Jayantamangalam: Paliyam MSS. Library, 1925. Pp. xxviii + 98. Rs. 2/4.

Blake (F. R.). A Grammar of the Tagālog Language. (American Oriental Series, Vol. 1.) New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1925. Pp. xxxii + 324. $4.00.

Blumhardt (J. F.). Catalogue of the Oriya Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch. 1924. Pp. vi + 24. $2.50.

Blumhardt (J. F.). Catalogue of the Bengali and Assamese Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1924. Pp. vi + 22. $2.50.

Bolotoff, A. A. The Amur and its Basin. Harbin: Manchuria Research Society, 1925.

Bukhsh, S. Khuda. The Arab Civilization. Translated from the German of Joseph Hell. Cambridge, England: W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd., 1926.

Catalogue of the Arabic and Persian Manuscripts in the Oriental Public Library at Bankipore. Volume VIII (Persian MSS.). Biography, Romances, Tales and Anecdotes. Prepared by Maulavi Abdul Muqtadir. Patna: Government Printing, 1925.

Catalogue of the Arabic and Persian Manuscripts in the Oriental Public Library at Bankipore. Volume V (Arabic MSS.). Tradition, Part II. Prepared by Maulavi Abdul Hamid. Patna, Government Printing, 1925.

Chaine, M. La chronologie des temps chrétiens de L'Egypte et de l'Ethiopie. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1925.

Chakravarti (P. C.). Linguistic Speculations of the Hindus, being the first part of a thesis on the philosophy of Sanskrit grammar. (Reprint, from the *Journal of the Department of Letters?*). Calcutta: Calcutta University Press, 1925. Pp. 47-135.

Chakravarti (P. C.). Linguistic Speculations of the Hindus. Part II: Semantics. (Reprint, from the *Journal of the Department of Letters*, Vol. XII, pp. 137-185). Calcutta: Calcutta University Press, 1925.

Chakravarti (P. C.). Theory of Sphoṭa. (Reprint, from the *Calcutta Review*, January, 1926, pp. 1-27. Calcutta: Calcutta University Press, 1926.

Chakravarti (P. C.). The Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali, Adhyāya 1, Pāda 1, Āhnika 1, translated into English, with historical, philosophical, philological and explanatory notes. (Reprint, from the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, December, 1925.) Calcutta: Calcutta Oriental Press.

Chakravarti (P. C.). Evolution of Sanskrit Grammar. (Reprint, from the *Calcutta Review*, August, 1925, pp. 216-228.)

Crooke (W.). Religion and Folklore of Northern India. Prepared for the press by R. E. Enthoven. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1926. Pp. 471. $7.00.

Descriptive Sociology; or, Groups of Sociological Facts. Classified and arranged by Herbert Spencer. Types of Lowest Races, Negritto Races and Malayo-Polynesian Races. Compiled and abstracted upon the plan organized by Herbert Spencer, by David Duncan. Edited by Henry R. Tedder. London: Williams and Norgate, Ltd., 1925.

Descriptive Sociology; or, Groups of Sociological Facts. Classified and arranged by Herbert Spencer. Ancient Egyptians. Compiled and abstracted upon the plan organized by Herbert Spencer. By Professor Sir W. Flinders Petrie. Issued by Mr. Spencer's Trustees. London: Williams and Norgate, Ltd., 1925.

Driver, G. R. and Hodgson, Leonard. Nestorius, The Bazaar of Heracleides. Newly translated from the Syriac and edited with an Introduction, Notes and Appendices. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1925.

Enzyklopädie des Judentums. Berlin: Verlag "Eschkol," 1926.

Formichi (C.). Il Pensiero Religioso nell' India prima del Buddha. (Storia delle Religioni, Vol. 5.) Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1925. Pp. xii + 287.

Godard (A.). Ghazni; Flury (S.). Le Décor Épigraphique des Monuments de Ghazna. (Extrait de la Revue *Syria*, 1925, pp. 58-90). Paris: Librairie Paul Geuthner, 1925.

Goldberg, Levi Chisda-. Der Osirisname "Roi." Leningrad: 1925.

Goldziher, Ignaz. Vorlesungen über den Islam. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1925.

Griswold, H. D. The Religion of the Ṛigveda. (The Religious Quest of India Series.) New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1923. Pp. xxiv + 392.

Guillaume, Alfred. The Traditions of Islam. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1924.

Haloun (G.). Seit wann kannten die Chinesen die Tocharer oder Indogermanen überhaupt. Erster Teil. Leipzig: Verlag der Asia Minor, 1926. viii + 208.

Haṃsarāja. Vedic Koṣa. With an elaborate introduction on the History of the Brāhmaṇa Literature, by Bhagavad Datta. (L. Dwarka Dass Memorial Volume.) Lahore: Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College, 1926. Pp. 96 + 4 + 700. Rs. 12.

Heffening, Willi. Das islamische Fremdenrecht. Hanover: Orient-Buchhandlung Heinz Lafaire, 1925.

Hesperis. Volume V. Paris: 1925.

Hitti, Philip K. Al-Baghdadi's Characteristics of Muslim Sects. Cairo: Al-Hilal Printing Press, 1924.

Indogermanische Forschungen. XLIII Band: 3/4 Heft. Berlin und Leipzig: Verlag von Walter de Gruyter und Co., 1926.

Indogermanische Forschungen. XLIV Band: 1 Heft. Berlin und Leipzig: Verlag von Walter de Gruyter und Co., 1926.

Jain (C. R.). Jain Conceptions, containing Immortality and Joy, and Jain Theory of Karma. Delhi: The Jain Mitra Mandal (Dariba Kalan), 1926. Pp. 22. Anna 1.

Jaina Gazette. Vol. XXII, Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8 (May, June, July, August, 1926). Madras: The Jaina Gazette Office.

James, Arthur Charles. Taboo Among the Ancient Hebrews. Philadelphia, 1925.

Jayamañgalā, of Śañkarācārya. Edited by H. Śarmā, with an introduction by Gopi Nath Kaviraj. (Calcutta Oriental Series, No. 19.) Calcutta: Dr. Narendra Nath Law, 1926. Pp. 10 + 10 + 69. Rs. 2.

Journal of the Anthropological Society of Bombay. Vol. XIII, No. 4. Bombay: British India Press, 1926.

Journal of Indian History. Vol. III, Part 1. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1924.

Kincaid (C. A.) and Parasnis (D. B.). A History of the Maratha People. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1925. Pp. xii + 254. $3.50.

King, Sir Lucas White. Badayi', The Odes of Sheikh Muslihud-Din Sa'di Shirazi. Edited and translated. London: Luzac and Co.

de Lens, A. R. Pratiques des Harems Marocains. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1925.

Le Strange, G. Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate from Contemporary Arabic and Persian Sources. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1924.

Löhr, Max. Des Deuteronomium. Berlin: Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte m. b. H., 1925.

Longrigg, Stephen Hemsley. Four Centuries of Modern Iraq. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1925.

Macurdy (G. H.). Troy and Paeonia, with glimpses of ancient Balkan history and religion. New York: Columbia University Press, 1925. Pp. xii + 259. $3.75.

Mānasollāsa. Volume I, edited by G. K. Shrigondekar. (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. 28.) Baroda: Central Library, 1925. Pp. xviii + 146. Rs. 2/8.

Margoliouth, D. S. The Relations between Arabs and Israelites prior to the Rise of Islam. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1924.

Martinovitch (N. N.). A Catalogue of Turkish and Persian Manuscripts belonging to Robert Garrett and deposited in the Princeton University Library. Princeton (N. J.): Princeton University Press, 1926. Pp. iv + 46.

Mercer, Samuel A. B. The Recovery of Forgotten Empires. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1925.

Mercier, Louis. La parure des cavaliers et l'insigne des preux. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1924.

Mishra (U.). Physical Theory of Sound and its Origin in Indian

Thought. (Reprint, from the *Allahabad University Studies*, Vol. II, pp. 239-290.)

Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen. Edited by Dr. Eugen Mittwoch. Volume XXVIII, Parts 1, 2 and 3. Berlin: 1925.

Moberg, Axel. The Book of the Himyarites. Edited, with Introduction and Translation. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1924.

Nalavilāsa Nāṭaka, of Rāmachandra Sūri. Edited by G. K. Shrigondekar and L. B. Gandhi, with an introduction by the latter. (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. 29). Baroda: Central Library, 1926. Pp. 40 + 91. Rs. 2/4.

Obbink, H. W. De Magische Beteekenis van den Maam inzonderheid in Het Oude Egypte. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1925.

O'Leary, De Lacy. The Difnar (Antiphonarium) of the Coptic Church (first four months). London: Luzac & Co., 1926.

Paret, Rudi. Sirat Saif ibn Dhi Jazan. Hannover: Orient-Buchhandlung Heinz Lafaire, 1924.

Pavanadütam, of Dhoyī. Edited with critical and historical introduction, Sanskrit notes, variants, etc., etc. by C. Chakravarti. (Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat Series, No. 13.) Calcutta: Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat, 1926. Pp. 38 + 36 + 5. As. 12.

Payne (C. H.). Scenes and Characters from Indian History, as described in the works of some Old Masters. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch. Pp. x + 251. $2.00.

Proceedings and Transactions of the Third Oriental Conference, Madras, December 22nd to 24th, 1924. Madras: Law Printing House, 1925. Pp. lxxii + 745.

Rescher, O. Orientalistische Miszellen. Konstantinopel: 1925.

Ricard, P. Art de la reliure et de la dorure. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1925.

Richmond, Ernest Tatham. The Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1924.

Sādhanamālā. Volume I, edited by Benoytosh Bhattacharyya. (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. 26.) Baroda: Central Library, 1925. Pp. xxiv + 342. Rs. 5.

Schoy, Carl. Abhandlung des Schaichs ibn 'Ali Al-Hasan ibn Al-Hasan ibn Al-Haitham: Über die Natur der Spuren (Flecken), die man auf der Oberfläche des Mondes sieht. Hannover: Orient-Buchhandlung Heinz Lafaire, 1925.

Seymour, St. John D. Tales of King Solomon. Oxford: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1924.

Shrigondekar (G. K.) and Siromani (K. S. R. S.). A Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Central Library Baroda. Volume I: Vedic. (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. 27.) Baroda: Central Library, 1925. Pp. xxix + 362. Rs. 6.

Singh (Bhai Vir). Nargas, Songs of a Sikh. Translated into English by Puran Singh, with a foreword by Ernest Rhys. New York: Dutton, 1924. Pp. xii + 104. $2.00.

Skvortzow, B. W. The Giant Water Lily of the Sungari Lakes. Harbin: Manchuria Research Society, 1925.

Spiegelberg, Wilhelm. Die Glaubwürdigkeit von Herodots Bericht über Ägypten im Lichte der ägyptischen Denkmäler. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1926.

Stevenson, Wm. B. Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1924.

Tag eddin Es-Subki's Mu'id en-ni'am wa mubid en-niqam. (Über die moralischen Pflichten der verschiedenen islamischen Bevölkerungsklassen). Konstantinopel: 1925.

Tallgren, A. J. Los Nombres Arabes de las Estrellas y la Transcripcion Alfonsina. Madrid: 1925.

Thompson, R. Campbell. Assyrian Medical Texts from the Originals in the British Museum. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1923.

Tremayne, Arch. Records from Erech; Time of Cyrus and Cambyses (539-521 B. C.) New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925.

Tschudi, Rudolf. Das Chalifat. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, 1926.

Wali, Maulavi Abdul. Life and Work of Jawad Sabat, an Arab Traveller, Writer and Apologist. Calcutta and Simla: Thacker, Spink & Co., 1925.

Weiss, Adolph. Mose Ben Maimon Führer der Unschlüssigen. Volumes 2 and 3. Leipzig: Verlag von Felix Meiner, 1924.

Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen. Band XVI, Heft 1/2. Berlin: Verlag von Dietrich Reimer (Ernst Vohsen) A.-G., 1926.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY.

The Executive Committee, by unanimous vote, has elected the following to corporate membership in the Society:

Prof. S. M. Zamin Ali
Mr. C. C. Berg
Dr. Sheldon H. Blank
Prof. Charles S. Braden
Mr. Roger S. Greene
Prof. Clarence H. Hamilton
Rev. Dr. John Hedley
Prof. E. K. Higdon
Prof. Masumi Hino
Prof. Mohammad Iqbal
Prof. K. A. Subramania Iyer
Prof. I. W. Johory
Prof. Robert J. Kellogg
Prof. Fida Ali Khan
Prof. M. Haimídullah Khan
Dr. Bimala Charan Law
Mr. Albert J. Leon
Prof. Benjamin March
Rev. Dr. Yohan Masih
Mr. B. C. Mazumdar
Mr. Umesha Mishra
Prof. Arjuna Nâtha
Mr. William M. Randall
Prof. Lemuel Sadoc
Prof. Kokileswar Sastri
Prof. Albert J. Saunders
Hon. Khan Bahadur Chaudhri Shahabuddin
Prof. Sri Ram Sharma
Prof. B. K. Goswami Shastri
Prof. S. Mohamad Sibtain
Rev. Dr. G. W. Thatcher
Rev. M. T. Titus
Mr. J. A. V. Turck
Prof. A. C. Vidhyābhūṣan
Rev. Dr. A. L. Wiley
Rev. Ross Wilson
Prof. A. S. Woodburne
Mr. E. C. Worman

The President has appointed the following to serve as a Committee of Cooperation with the Editor of the Dictionary of American Biography:

Professors A. V. Williams Jackson, H. Preserved Smith, Frederick W. Williams, and the Corresponding Secretary, who has kindly consented to act as secretary of the Committee. The Committee solicits information and suggestions on American Orientalists whose names should be included in the Dictionary.

The Society regrets to announce the death of one of its Directors, Professor PAUL HAUPT, of the Johns Hopkins University, which occurred on December 15, 1926. The President and Professor FRANK R. BLAKE represented the Society at the funeral on December 17. A full appreciation of the scientific work of the deceased will appear in the next number of the JOURNAL.

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

The American Council of Learned Societies has been enabled, through an annual subvention of $5,000 to offer in 1926, 1927 and 1928 a limited number of small grants to individual scholars to assist them in carrying on definite projects of research in the humanistic and social sciences (philosophy, philology and literature, linguistics, art and archaeology, history, economics, political science, sociology, and related fields).

Only modest sums can be awarded to applicants whose requests are approved, and the maximum amount of any single grant cannot exceed $300.

The grants are restricted to scholars who are citizens of the United States or who are permanently domiciled or employed therein.

Applications should be addressed to Professor Guy Stanton Ford, Chairman, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. and should reach him not later than January 31.

FELLOWSHIPS FOR GERMAN UNIVERSITIES

The American German Student Exchange, Inc., announces that a limited number of fellowships for study in Germany will be awarded to American students for the year 1927-28.

For application blanks, and full information, address: Carl J. Friedrich, American German Student Exchange, Inc., Institute of International Education, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Application blanks, properly filled out and accompanied by all required credentials, must be in the hands of the Exchange by February 15, 1927.

YALE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL

Sterling Fellowships for Research in the Humanistic Studies and the Natural Sciences.

Applications for these Fellowships should be addressed to the Dean of the Graduate School of Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, on blanks which may be obtained from him. Applications must be submitted by March 1.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

American Oriental Society

AT THE MEETING IN PHILADELPHIA, PA., 1926

The annual sessions of the Society, forming its one hundred and thirty-eighth meeting, were held in Philadelphia at the University of Pennsylvania and the Dropsie College, on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of Easter Week, April 7, 8, 9, 1926.

The following members were present at one or more sessions:

Abbott
Adler
Archer
Barret
Barton
Bates, Mrs.
Bender
Benjamin
Benze
Berry
Bobrinskoy
Brav
Briggs, G. W.
Brown, W. N.
Bull
Butin
Chapman
Chiera
Clark
DeLong
Dembitz
Donohugh, Mrs.
Duncan
Edgerton, F.
Elzas
Ember
Enslin
Epler
Foerster
Gehman
Gellot
Grant
Grieve, Miss
Haupt
Hitti
Hock
Husik
Hyde, W. W.
Jastrow, Mrs.
Johnson, Miss
Jung, L.
Kent
Keogh
Kraeling, C. H.
Kraeling, E. G. H.
Lea
Lhevinne
McClellan
Margolis, M. L.
Martin
Martinovitch
Matthews, I. G.
Meek
Mercer
Miner
Montgomery
Morgenstern
Newbold
Newell
Ogden, C. J.
Ogden, Miss
Olmstead
Parulekhar
Reich
Rowley
Rudolph, Miss
Russell
Sanders, F. K.
Saunders, Mrs.
Schmidt
Schoff
Schwartz
Scott, Mrs.
Scott, R. J.
Skoss
Speiser
Taylor, W. R.
Torrey
Weitzel
Zeitlin

Total 80

THE FIRST SESSION

At 11.07 a. m. on Wednesday, at the University of Pennsylvania, the first session of the Society was called to order by President W. E. Clark. The reading of the minutes of the meeting in New Haven in 1925 was dispensed with as they were already in print (JOURNAL 45. 339-364); there were no corrections and they were approved.

Professor Montgomery, as Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements, presented its report in the form of a printed programme. The succeeding sessions were appointed for Wednesday afternoon at 2.30 p. m., Thursday morning at 9.30 a. m., Thursday afternoon at 2.30 p. m., Friday morning at 9.30 a. m. and Friday afternoon at 2 p. m. It was announced that the University of Pennsylvania invited the members to luncheon at Houston Hall on Wednesday at one o'clock; that the Dropsie College invited them to luncheon at the college on Thursday at the same hour; and that the annual subscription dinner would be at the Rittenhouse Hotel on Thursday evening at half-past seven.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY

The Corresponding Secretary, Dr. Charles J. Ogden, presented the following report:

The work of the Corresponding Secretary during the year now closing has been mainly of a routine nature, concerning which no special report is necessary. It is to be regretted that our relations with the learned societies abroad have been altogether inactive lately, and it might be considered whether a Committee on Cooperation with Foreign Societies, such as we had some years ago, could not be reconstituted with advantage. This Society has been invited to send representatives to the Archaeological Congress in Palestine and Syria, which is about to assemble in Beirut, and word has been received from our members now in Palestine, Director Albright, Dean Badè, Professors Dougherty and Fisher, and President Kyle, that they will attend the Congress or some portion of it as our delegates.

The contact of this Society with the other humanistic societies in this country has been closer, owing to the intermediation of the American Council of Learned Societies, for which Dr. Waldo G. Leland, until recently its Executive Secretary, has been largely responsible. Your Corresponding Secretary attended the second annual conference of the Secretaries of the constituent societies held in connection with the meeting of the Council.

The principal topics discussed were the endowment campaigns now being undertaken by several of the societies and the cooperation of the individual societies in the two chief projects sponsored by the Council, namely the Survey of Humanistic Research in America and the Dictionary of American Biography. A fuller report on the activities of the Council will be made by our delegates later in this meeting.

A large portion of your Secretary's correspondence has to do with the arrangements for the annual meeting, and he would take this occasion to mention the difficulty of framing an evenly balanced program. The experience of the last seven years has shown that, despite the formal resolution passed by the Society in 1919, few members will remain for three full days, and hence it becomes necessary to overload the schedule of the first two and in practice to abandon the sixth session. Neither of the proposed alternatives, however, the limitation of the number of papers or the division of the meeting into sections, has commended itself to the judgment of the Society.

The corporate membership is now 543, a loss of 20 during the year. There were 45 members added by election, but 52 resigned or were dropped from the list, and 13 were removed from our number by death, as well as one honorary member. The names of those deceased are as follows:

Sir RAMKRISHNA GOPAL BHANDARKAR, late professor of Oriental languages in the Deccan College, Poona, had been an honorary member of the Society since 1887. Long recognized as the foremost native Sanskrit scholar of India, on both philological and historical lines, he will be especially remembered in the West by his work on "Vaishnavism, Saivism, and Minor Religious Systems," in the *Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie* (1913), a theme in which his profound religious insight as well as his learning found expression. Died August 24, 1925, aged 88.

Rev. ALBERT T. CLAY, Ph. D., professor of Assyriology and Babylonian literature at Yale University, has already been fittingly commemorated in the pages of our JOURNAL, so that it would be superfluous even to mention here his many contributions to scholarship. He was intimately connected with the work of this Society as Librarian for thirteen years (1911-1924), during eight of which (1915-1923) he was Treasurer as well. He held the office of President during the year 1924-1925 and was a member of the Board of Directors at the time of his death. In every capacity he gave to the Society not only his devoted labor but also the stimulus of his energy and enthusiasm, the loss of which is indeed irremediable. Elected in 1907. Died September 14, 1925, aged 58.

CHARLES F. KENT, Ph. D., since 1901 professor of Biblical literature at Yale University, was the author of numerous works on the Bible, especially in its historical aspect. He was a leading figure in higher religious education, being the director of the National Council Schools of Religion and the editor of the Historical Series for Bible Students. Elected in 1890. Died May 2, 1925, aged 57.

EDWARD S. MORSE, Director of the Peabody Museum at Salem, Mass., since 1880, though primarily a scientist, was also a collector and student of Japanese ceramics, and held the position of keeper of Japanese pottery at the Boston Art Museum. He had spent three years in Japan (1877-1880) as professor of zoology at the Imperial University of Tokyo, and had written several books on life in Japan and China. Elected in 1894. Died December 20, 1925, aged 87.

Rev. JACOB E. WERREN, of Abington, Mass., had been pastor successively of the New Church there and in Cambridge, as well as professor of sacred languages in the New Church Theological Seminary at Cambridge until his retirement in 1922. Elected in 1894. Died November 9, 1925, aged 82.

Rev. ABRAHAM YOHANNAN, Ph. D., born in Persia of a priestly family of the Assyrian Church, was for many years connected with St. Bartholomew's Parish, New York, and from 1894 until his death was lecturer in Oriental languages at Columbia University. A linguist of wide attainments and a scholar of deep learning, he assisted in the revision of the Bible in Syriac, and had compiled a Modern Syriac Dictionary, of which only the first instalment was published (1900). He was a regular attendant at our meetings and at the time of his death was President of the New York Oriental Club. Elected in 1894. Died November 9, 1925, aged 72.

Mr. CHARLES DANA BURRAGE, of Boston, lawyer and capitalist, was connected with Oriental studies through his interest in Omar Khayyam. He was a founder and sometime president of the Omar Khayyam Club of America, and had brought out many publications concerning the Persian poet through the Rosemary Press, which he established. Elected in 1909. Died January 5, 1926, aged 68.

Rev. KAUFMANN KOHLER, Ph. D., minister of Temple Beth-El, New York, from 1879 to 1903, and from that date to 1922 president of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, was one of the leading scholars of Reformed Judaism in America and the author of many works on Jewish theology. He was an editor of the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, a member of the committee that prepared a new translation of the Bible, and one of the committee on the editing of the "Jewish Classics" series. Elected in 1917. Died January 28, 1926, aged 82.

Rev. ROBERT T. RIDDLE had been for seven years a member of the faculty of St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa., and was at the time of his death professor of fundamental moral theology. Elected in 1920. Died January 4, 1926, aged 38.

Mrs. JOHN KING VAN RENSSELAER, of New York City, was the author of works on genealogy and the social life of old New York, as well as on the history of playing cards. Through her interest in the latter subject she became a member of this Society in 1920. Died May 11, 1925.

Rev. THOMAS FRANCIS CARTER, Ph.D., for twelve years a missionary of the Presbyterian Church at Nan-su-chow in An-hwei province, China, on his return to America in 1923 became assistant professor of Chinese at Columbia University. Before his untimely death he had just completed his doctoral thesis on "The Invention of Printing in China and its Spread Westward." Elected in 1923. Died August 6, 1925, aged 43.

The Secretary has also to record the deaths of Miss ETHEL BEERS, of Chicago (elected in 1915), Miss ETHEL E. WHITNEY of Boston (elected in 1921), and Mr. HALSEY A. RINE of Palo Alto, Calif. (elected in 1923).

Upon motion the report of the Corresponding Secretary was accepted.

The following resolutions were adopted:

Whereas, in the death of Albert Tobias Clay the American Oriental Society has been deprived of one who for many years was an active member and a faithful officer; and

Whereas, he was one who was recognized as exemplifying in high degree those qualities which are the pillars of the Society; the spirit of independent research; an earnest and unselfish desire to cooperate with his fellows in advancing the interests of the organization; and a warm and simple friendliness which was potent in our common life; be it therefore

Resolved: that the Society place on record its profound sense of the loss which it has sustained in his untimely death, and its wish to cherish his memory and continue his interrupted work; and be it further

Resolved: that these Resolutions be entered in the minutes of the Society, and that a copy be sent to the family of the deceased.

The Corresponding Secretary read a letter from the Palestine Oriental Society transmitting resolutions passed following the death of Professor Clay. The Corresponding Secretary was requested to make suitable acknowledgment.

Tribute was paid to deceased members: to Abraham Yohannan and Thomas Francis Carter by Dr. Ogden.

It was voted to send greetings to Professor Lanman, a member of the Society for fifty years, and to Professor Theodor Nöldeke, the oldest honorary member, who had recently celebrated his ninetieth birthday.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

The Treasurer, Professor J. C. Archer, presented his report and that of the Auditing Committee:

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1925.

Receipts

Balance Jan. 1, 1925	$2,267.82	
Annual dues, 1925	2,442.47	
Sales	1,050.21	
Income from Trustees of Nies Fund (for publication)	531.12	
Publication Fund	108.67	
Dividend (Chicago, Rock Is. & Pacific Ry.)	120.00	
Interest:		
Yale University (interest on deposit)	90.88	
Mortgage (Conn. Title Co.)	360.00	
U. S. Liberty Bonds	63.75	
Minneapolis Gen'l Electric Co.	50.00	
Virginia Ry. Co.	50.00	
Authors' reprints, corrections	94.10	
Refund (book reviews)	12.00	
		$7,241.02

Expenditures

Publication	$2,320.38	
Repayment to Edgerton of advance for Panchatantra	500.00	
Blake's Tagalog Grammar, balance for printing	327.00	
Blake's Tagalog Grammar, binding	136.00	
Honoraria: Edgerton	200.00	
Margolis	200.00	
Customs dues:		
Edgerton's Panchatantra	150.00	
Blake's Tagalog Grammar	95.95	
Encyclopedia of Islam subvention (2 years)	100.00	
Book reviews (gross)	88.75	
Contribution to American Council of Learned Societies (2 years)	61.50	
Mailing the Journal	119.51	
Index to the Journal	160.00	
Library: Binding	199.10	
Back numbers of Journal	44.00	
Postage	3.00	
Corresponding Secretary's expenses	148.28	
Editors' expenses	22.24	
Treasurer's assistant	100.00	
Postage and clerical	53.59	
Membership Committee's expenses	75.13	
Balance, Jan 1, 1926	2,136.59 *	
		$7,241.02

* Includes sums received and set aside for special publications in 1924 and 1925, amounting to $1681.19.

The following funds are held by the Society:

Charles W. Bradley Fund	$3,000.00
Alexander I. Cotheal Fund	1,500.00
William Dwight Whitney Fund	1,000.00
Life Membership Fund	3,350.00
Publication Fund	78.50

The interest from these funds is used for publication purposes.

The foregoing funds are represented in the assets of the Society held by Yale University for the Treasurer of the Society. These assets were on Jan. 1, 1926, as follows:

Cash	$2,136.59
Conn. Mortgage Co. mort.	6,000.00
Stock (Chicago, Rock Is. & Pacific Ry.)—20 shares.	
Bonds: U. S. Liberty Loan	1,000.00
Virginia Ry. Co	1,000.00
Minneapolis Gen'l Electric Co.	1,000.00

Report of the Auditing Committee

We hereby certify that we have examined the account of the Treasurer of the Society, and have found it correct, and that the foregoing statement is in conformity therewith. We have compared the entries with the vouchers and the account book held for the Society by the Treasurer of Yale University, and have found all correct.

Charles C. Torrey,
F. W. Williams,
Auditors.

Upon motion the reports of the Treasurer and the Auditing Committee were accepted.

Report of the Librarian

The Librarian, Professor Andrew Keogh, presented his report and upon motion it was accepted:

LIST OF ACCESSIONS FOR THE YEAR 1925-26

R. Accademia dei Lincei, Roma. Classe di scienze morale, storiche e filologiche. Rendiconti, serie 6, v. 1, fasc. 1-4. 1925.

American Oriental Society. Journal. 1849-1925. 58v.

Asiatic society of Japan. Transactions. 2 ser., v. I. [1924]

Benoytosh Bhattacharyya. The Indian Buddhist iconography. 1924.

Bhandarkar oriental research institute, Poona. List of manuscripts collected for the government manuscript library. 1925.

Bhojadeva. Samaranganasutradhara. v. 1. 1924. (Gaekwad's Oriental series, no. XXV.)

Casanowicz, I. M. The dragon god (Dai-ja) in Idzumo, Japan. 1925.

Castagné, J. Les Basmatchis. 1925.

Ceylon. Archaeological survey. Memoirs. v. 1. 1924.

Chandra Chakraberty. An interpretation of ancient Hindu medicine. 1923.

Coomaraswamy, A. K. Bibliographies of Indian art. 1925.

Daji, J. K. Parsi education. [192-?.]

Dr. A. S. Bettelheim memorial foundation. Veröffentlichungen, 2. [1925.]

Dorpat. Universitet. Acta et commentationes. B. Humaniora. V. 1924.

Edgerton, F. The Bhagavad Gita. 1925.

Harvard university. Associated Harvard clubs. Reports of officers and committees for presentation at the twenty-seventh annual meeting. 1925.

Hebrew university of Jerusalem. Institute of Jewish studies. Opening exercises and prospectus. 5685.

Hultzsch, E., *ed.* Inscriptions of Asoka. 1925. (Corpus inscriptionum indicarum, v. 1.)

Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakām. History of the conquest of Egypt, North Africa and Spain, known as the Futūḥ Miṣr. 1922.

India. Gazetteers. Burma. B. volumes. Census tables. Chin Hills, Karenni States, Northern Shan States. Pakokku Hill. [1925]. 4v.

Indian historical quarterly. v. 1, no. 1. March, 1925. [1925.]

Java—Institut. Programma voor het congres. 1924.

Jerusalem. University. Dept. of Jewish studies. Bulletin, no. 2. [1925.]

Kashmir. Archaeological survey. Memoirs, no. 1-2. 1924.

Kroeber, A. L. Handbook of the Indians of California. 1925. (Smithsonian institution. Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 78.)

Kuka, M. N. Wit, humour, and fancy of Persia. 1923.

Lambert, R. Lexique hiéroglyphique. 1925.

Laufer, B. Ivory in China. 1925. (Field museum of natural history, Chicago. Anthropology leaflet, 21.)

Linschoten vereeniging. 17 jaarverslag, 1924. Lijst der uitgaven. Naamlijst der leden op 1 januari 1925.

London institution. School of Oriental studies. Report of the governing body and statement of accounts for the year ending 31st July, 1925.

Madras. Government oriental manuscripts library. Descriptive catalogue of the Telugu manuscripts by S. Kuppuswami Sastri. 1921.

Madras. Government oriental manuscripts library. Triennial catalogue of manuscripts collected during the triennium 1916-17 to 1918-19, by S. Kuppuswami Sastri. v. 3, pt. 2. Tamil. 1924.

Mann, A. Marine diatoms of the Philippine Islands. 1925.

Mark, J. Die Possessivsuffixe in den uralischen Sprachen. 1. Hälfte. 1925. (Suomalais-ugrilaisen seuram Toimituksia, 54.)

Mirzādeh Ishqī. Rastākhīz. Tr. from Persian by Irach J. S. Taraporewala. 1924.

North Manchuria and the Chinese eastern railway. 1924.

Oudheidkundige dienst in Nederlandsch-Indië. Publicaties. deel. I. 1925.

Paris. Musée Guimet. Exposition de récentes découvertes et de récents travaux archéologiques en Afghanistan et en Chine. 1925.

Pavolini, P. E., *tr.* Aforyzmy indyjskie. 1925.

Philippine Islands. Department of public instruction. Bureau of education. 25th annual report of the director of education. 1924. 1925.

Pithawalla, M. Daily dips into the Avesta. 1924.

Punjab. Board of economic inquiry. Rural section. Publication, 4-5. 1925.

——— Questionnaire for economic inquiries. 1924.

Rea, G. B. The greatest civilizing force in Eastern Asia. 1924.

Rocznik orjentalistyczny, wydaje Polskie towarzystwo orjentalistyczne. t. II. (1919-24). 1925.

Saunders, K., *ed.* Lotuses of the Mahāyāna. [1924.]

Schlesische Gesellschaft für vaterländische Cultur. 92-96. Jahres-Bericht. 1915-19.

Schlesische Jahrbücher für Geistes- und Naturwissenschaften. Jahrgang I-II(1-4). 1922-24.

Scott, J. G. Burma. 1924.

Societas orientalis fennica. Studia orientalia. I. Helsingforsiae, 1925.

Srinagar. Sri Pratap Singh museum. Handbook of the archaeological and numismatic sections by Ram Chandra Kak. 1923.

Stejneger, L. Chinese amphibians and reptiles in the U. S. national museum, 1925.

Sushil Kumar De. Studies in the history of Sanskrit poetics. v. II. 1925.

Swaminatha Aiyar, R. The Āryan affinities of Dravidian pronouns. [1924?.]

Vahid, A. A condensed dictionary, English-Turkish. 1924.

Waddell, L. A. Indo-Sumerian seals deciphered. 1925.

Whitebread, Charles. The Indian medical exhibit of the division of medicine in the U. S. National museum. 1925.

Woo, J. Le problème constitutionnel chinois. 1925. (Bibliothèque de l'Institut de droit comparé de Lyon. Études et documents, t. 11.)

Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des nachbiblischen Judentums. Neue Folge. 2. Bd., 1925, Hft. 1/2. 1925.

The Librarian also stated that the catalogue of the Society's Library, which had been prepared by Professors Clay and Torrey and others with the assistance of members of the staff of the Yale University Library, was now ready for publication and that its publication had been much desired by the late Professor Clay;

that an index of names, titles and subjects in the catalogue was also nearly ready, the work having been done in the Yale Library; that Professors Torrey, Hopkins and Asakawa had helped with linguistic difficulties; that the catalogue had been completed and the index made at the expense of the Yale Library which had also undertaken to read the proof of the work. He reminded the members present that the Society's Library had been housed at Yale for seventy years and was now to remain there indefinitely. He added that the space it was to be assigned in the new Stirling Memorial Library at Yale was three times as large as formerly, the new library building being the largest at any university in the world, and that the oriental books of the Yale Library were to be placed in space adjoining that occupied by the Library of the Society.

Report of the Editors of the Journal

Professor Franklin Edgerton, the senior Editor of the JOURNAL, presented the report of the Editors, and upon motion it was accepted:

Since the last annual report of the Editors, Volume 45 of the Journal has been completed by the issuance of Numbers 2-4, and Number 1 of Volume 46 has been issued, in March 1926. The same excellent printers continue to serve us faithfully and well.

Copy is now on hand in sufficient quantity to fill more than Number 2 of Volume 46. If the resources of the Society permitted, we could enlarge the JOURNAL beyond its present limits of approximately 400 pages per year, and we could then print the contributions which come to us with less of the delay which is so annoying to authors.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON,
MAX L. MARGOLIS,
Editors.

Report of the Executive Committee

The Corresponding Secretary presented the report of the Executive Committee, as printed in the JOURNAL (45. 337 and 46. 96); upon motion the actions of the Committee were ratified.

Election of Members

The following persons, recommended by the Directors, were duly

elected corporate members of the Society (the list includes six who were elected at a later session):

Rev. Dr. Robert C. Armstrong
Mr. Frederick A. Baepler
Rev. Dr. John J. Banninga
Prof. Miner Searle Bates
Rev. Dr. Charles D. Benjamin
Rabbi Barnett R. Brickner
Dean Oswald E. Brown
Rabbi Adolph Coblenz
Prof. K. de Codrington
Rev. Bernard Cuneo
Prof. John Pitt Deane
Mr. Arthur A. Dembitz
President Bayard Dodge
Mrs. Agnes C. L. Donohugh
Mr. Joseph Durst
Rev. Dr. William C. Emhardt
Mr. Stuart A. Epler
Mr. Sidney I. Esterson
Dr. Shammai Feldman
Rabbi Wm. H. Fineshriber
Rev. Dr. Fred Foerster
Prof. Henry T. Fowler
Rabbi Leon Fram
Dr. Ralph Goldsmith
Miss Jane F. Goodloe
Mr. Jacob Grape
Prof. Frank H. Hallock
Prof. Raymond S. Haupert
Rev. Willis E. Hogg
Prof. Abraham Z. Idelsohn
Rev. Frederick W. Johnson
Mr. Louis L. Kaplan
Mr. Charles F. Kelley
Mr. John P. Kellogg
Rev. Robert O. Kevin, Jr.
Prof. Frank G. Lankard
Mr. John F. Lewis
Rev. Walter McCree
Prof. Alexander Marx
Rev. Silvano Matulich
Mr. Toyozo W. Nakarai
Prof. Abraham A. Neuman
Mr. N. B. Parulekhar
Mr. Hemendra K. Rakhit
Rev. J. Merle Rife
Prof. M. Rostovtzeff
Prof. George Rowley
Rev. Keith C. Seele
Rev. Arthur R. Siebens
Dr. Solomon L. Skoss
Rev. Charles L. Taylor, Jr.
Prof. Elbert D. Thomas
Mr. Baruch Weitzel
Mr. Percival W. Whittlesey
Prof. Leo Wiener
Rabbi Louis Wolsey
Dr. W. Wovschin
Prof. Solomon Zeitlin

[Total: 58]

Professor Alfred Hillebrandt of Breslau, Germany, was unanimously elected to honorary membership.

Election of Officers

Professor G. S.Duncan, for the Committee on the Nomination of Officers for 1926, reported nominations for the several offices as follows:

President: Professor James A. Montgomery, of Philadelphia.
Vice-Presidents: President Julian Morgenstern, of Cincinnati;

Professor MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, of Baltimore; and Professor FRANKLIN EDGERTON, of Philadelphia.

Corresponding Secretary: Dr. CHARLES J. OGDEN, of New York City.

Recording Secretary: Dr. LUDLOW S. BULL, of New York City.

Treasurer: Professor JOHN C. ARCHER, of New Haven.

Librarian: Professor ANDREW KEOGH, of New Haven.

Editors of the Journal: Professor MAX L. MARGOLIS, of Philadelphia, and Dr. W. NORMAN BROWN, of Baltimore.

Directors, term expiring 1929: Professor CHARLES C. TORREY, of New Haven; the Rev. Dr. JUSTIN E. ABBOTT, of Summit, N. J.; and Professor GEORGE M. BOLLING, of Columbus.

Director to replace the late Professor Clay, term expiring 1928: Professor RAYMOND P. DOUGHERTY, of Baltimore.

The officers thus nominated were duly elected.

At this point an address of welcome was delivered by Vice-Provost McClellan of the University of Pennsylvania.

President Walter E. Clark then delivered an address on Some Misunderstandings about India.

The session adjourned at 12.55 p. m.

THE SECOND SESSION

The second session was called to order at 2.40 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon at the University of Pennsylvania; the reading of papers was immediately begun.

Professor NATHANIEL REICH, of the Dropsie College: The Egyptian Divorce of Amenothes in the collection of the University Museum. Remarks by Professors Haupt and Ember.

Professor J. A. MONTGOMERY, of the University of Pennsylvania: Exhibition of the first photographic copy of the uncial Codex Venetus of the Greek Old Testament.

This Codex is one of the few uncial codices of the Greek Old Testament, including the books from Job to IV Maccabees. The first part of the codex is now recognized in the Codex Basiliano-Vaticanus at Rome. The Venetus has never before been photographed, and so has not hitherto been used, as it deserves to be, in the scientific textual apparatus of the Greek Bible. The text is sub-Origenian and is provided with Origen's critical marks. The copy belongs to the Yarnall Library in the Philadelphia Divinity School.

Dr. E. A. SPEISER, of the University of Pennsylvania: The place of the Hurri in the history of Mesopotamia. Remarks by Professors Barton and Haupt.

It has long been suspected that the Assyrians owed much of their culture to a non-Semitic source. Recent discoveries have thrown considerable light upon the role of the Hurri in the civilization of the Near East. This people, or rather group of peoples, emerges now clearly out of the ethnic tangle of ancient Mesopotamia. The available data on the history of the Hurri are also briefly surveyed.

Professor EDWARD CHIERA, of the University of Pennsylvania: The history of a Hurri family. Remarks by Professors Barton, Haupt and Clark.

Recent excavations in the district of Kerkuk, Mesopotamia, have brought to light records which enable us to follow in detail the history of an ancient family for a period of four generations. No other group of cuneiform documents affords so many intimate glimpses into the social conditions of the Ancient Near East. Of great interest is also the fact that the tablets belonged to a non-Semitic people with a distinct civilization of its own.

Professor W. ROMAINE NEWBOLD, of the University of Pennsylvania: Two Aramaic inscriptions from San Sebastiano, Rome. Remarks by Professor Montgomery.

Professor ELIHU GRANT, of Haverford College: (a) Ancient Occupation of Modern Sites: Ramallah and neighborhood. (b) An instance of the modern sacrifice of hair in Palestine.

The writer lived at Ramallah, Palestine, for three years and last Spring was there for ten weeks. The paper deals with excursions in the neighborhood and deepened impressions of the evidences of early occupation of several of these modern sites. The rock-cut tombs were probably made for the well-to-do and give some hint of the population in the day of their use. They date perhaps from the Persian to the Roman period. Pottery, too, which is plentiful, is an indicator. But the main stress of the paper is on the building stone from the New Testament Age. It is of the drafted-edge, bossed-centre type of block commonly called Herodian. The huge size of certain of the blocks at Ramallah, et-Tayibeh, Mukhmas, &c. would indicate that they are nearly in their original home although now used in modern buildings.

At et-Tayibeh, sometimes called ancient Ephraim, is a Latin cemetery just south of the ruined ancient Church. Here there are two built-up, masonry tombs to the memory of the sons of a widow of the village. The boys died under peculiarly distressful circumstances in the period of the Great War. The disconsolate mother, who wore her

hair in two long strands, cut them off in the abandon of her grief and nailed one to either tomb.

Professor PHILIP K. HITTI, of Princeton University: The local background of the Druze revolt in Syria.

Dr. W. NORMAN BROWN, of the Johns Hopkins University: Change of Sex as a Hindu story motif. Remarks by President Morgenstern, Dr. Chapman and Mr. Dembitz.

Rabbi Dr. LEO JUNG, of New York City: Rabbinic Sources of Beowulf. Remarks by Dr. Chapman.

Rev. Dr. E. G. H. KRAELING, of Union Theological Seminary: Recent research on the problem of the Servant Poems in Deutero-Isaiah. Remarks by Professor Meek and Mr. Dembitz.

The destruction of the 'collective' interpretation by Fischer. Sellin's theory of Moses as the Servant. Mowinckel's theory of the author himself as the Servant. The question of Babylonian influence. A new solution: Deutero-Isaiah is the Servant, but the Servant Poems were written by one of his followers.

Dr. HENRY S. GEHMAN, of Philadelphia: The Coptic text of the Book of Daniel.

This paper expresses in brief form the results of a comparison of the Coptic text (Sahidic and Bohairic) with the Greek text of Swete and variants as published in Homes-Parsons.

THE THIRD SESSION

The third session was called to order at 9.55 o'clock on Thursday morning at the Dropsie College; the reading of papers was immetiately begun.

Mr. BARUCH WEITZEL, of Philadelphia: Some interesting points in the history of Ancient Nubia. Remarks by Professor Ember.

Dr. WILLIAM J. CHAPMAN, of the Hartford Theological Seminary: Conjectures respecting the Era of Tartessus. Remarks by Professors Haupt and Barret and Dr. Ogden.

Data available: (a) Strabo's statement (III, 1, 6) concerning the code and traditions of the Turdetani, extending over a period of 6000 years; (b) the presence of an Asianic element in this part of southern Spain, apparently akin to the Etruscans, whose cosmic chronology has Babylonian affinities. The statement of Herodotus (I, 163) that King Arganthonius (ob. c. 540 B. C.) lived 120 years and reigned 80 over the Tartessians, which not improbably means that the Tartessian monarch

died at or near the end of a cycle of 120 years. Possible connection of the Spanish *aera Caesarum*, 38 B. C., and also of the Mundane Era of Alphonso of Castile (fl. 1250), c. 6984 B. C., with the foregoing data. Since we do not know the *terminus ad quem*, and cannot infer it from either of the known intervals, our nearest approximation for the required epoch will run: B. C. 658 (or 538) + 6000 $\pm$ 120x years.

Mr. ARTHUR A. DEMBITZ, of Gratz College: The Egyptian Double Contracts of the type 'scriptura interior and exterior.' Remarks by Professor Ember.

Professor N. MARTINOVITCH, of Columbia University: The Widgery and Baroody Collections in the Princeton University Library. Remarks by Professors Haupt and Montgomery.

In 1925 Mr. Robert Garrett, of Baltimore, purchased two collections of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish manuscripts consisting of about 500 volumes and deposited them in the Library of Princeton University. These collections belonged formerly to Mr. Widgery, of Cambridge, England, and to Mr. Baroody, of Beirut, Syria. This paper gives a brief outline of both collections.

Professor LEROY C. BARRET, of Trinity College: The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, Book Fourteen.

Professor THEOPHILE J. MEEK, of the University of Toronto: A new use of the adverbial accusative in Hebrew. Remarks by President Morgenstern, Professors Montgomery and Kent, Dr. Ogden and Mr. Dembitz.

Strikingly characteristic of the Deuteronomic style is the frequent omission of the connecting *waw* with clauses. Investigation shows that in many instances these are subordinate clauses, and that they are used adverbially to the main clause. They may be best translated into English by the participial clause when the subject is the same as the main clause, and by the nominative absolute clause when the subject is different. In Hebrew they correspond exactly to the infinitive absolute clause. A good example is found in Joshua 11, where the infin. absol. of verse 11 appears as a finite verb in verse 12.

Professor PAUL HAUPT, of the Johns Hopkins University: (a) The shepherds in Zech. xi; (b) *S* for *š* in Semitic stems containing a labial; (c) Restoration of line 127 of the Flood-tablet; (d) Assyr. *lîṭu*, 'mystery.' Remarks by Professor Kent.

(a) The two *shepherds*, whom the Maccabean author of Zech. xi is directed to personate, are Onias and Alcimus (MF 122, n. 16). The *three shepherds* who were removed (Zech. 11, 8) are the founder of the Hasmonean dynasty, Simon, and two of his sons (1 Mac. 16, 16). Zech. 11, 8 is a misplaced gloss to *ṣĕ-ālû 'al-ăšār duqqārû* in Zech. 12, 10 (AJP 45, 53f) which explains the definite article. Zech. xi

and xii may have been written in two parallel columns (CoE 508^{i}). Read Zech. 11, 8^{a}: *ʿaṣ-ṣaḵḥîḏû ăṯ-šĕlôšṯ hâ-rôʿîm bĕ-ḵērû* (2 K 6, 23) *ăḥḥāṯ*.

(b) Semitic stems containing a labial often exhibit *s* for *š*. We find the same phenomenon in Egyptian. *Cf.* Ass. *sêbû*, seventh; *sâmnu*, eighth; *bussuru*, to bring good news; *kabâsu*, to tread; *sâmu* (= *šaḫamu;* cf. Syr. *šĕḥâmâ*, dusky, olive-colored, and Lat. *niger* for *dark green*) > *sându*, malachite = Heb. *šōham;* Ass. *nismatu* = Heb. *nĕšāmâ*, which may mean *desire*, just as the synonym of *nĕšāmâ* (WF 220^{i}): *näpš* has this meaning; also Syr. *sâṣqâ*, breath, means *desire*. Heb. *sĕḇîḇîm*, surroundings, neighborhood = Ass. *šibbu*, belt; Aram. *istĕmár* = Heb. *hištammér*. Cf. also Ass. *našpantu* < *sapânu* and Arab. *hásama* = *hášama*.

(c) NE 139, 127 should be read: *šabbâ šaptâšunu išaqqâ puxrêti*, their lips were compressed, all (lit. *the assemblages*, groups of the gods) *were wretched*. For *šabbâ* (from the stem of *šibbu*, belt) a variant has *katmâ*, were closed. The stem of *išaqqâ* corresponds to Arab. *šáqiỉa*, to be miserable, unhappy > *šáqṣah*, misery, misfortune = Ass. *šaqâtu* which does not mean *fear* (HW 685^{b}^{i}). In Ethiopic we have *šĕqâi*, vexation, plur. *šĕqâiât*. Combination with Heb. *šāqá'*, to sink, does not commend itself. *Puxrêti* is fem. plur. (with vocalic assimilation; see BA 1, 133, l. 11; JBL 36, 86^{i}; 37, 219^{m}; AJSL 32, 66^{m}; ZDMG 64, 604, l. 14) of *puxru* = Heb. *ḥōrp̄* which had originally the meaning of Heb. *āsîp̄* (cf. *Pur.* n. 146; AkF 46^{i}; JHUC 341, 47, Feb. 7).

(d) We must read NE 59, 6 not *ana lît Út-napištim*, to the strength of U. (which has been supposed to be the prototype of the Homeric *ἱερὸν μένος Ἀλκινόοιο*; see AJP 46, 209) but *ana lîṭ*, to the mystery or mysterious place, *i. e.* Elysium (JHUC 286, 46) beyond the mouth of the rivers, *i. e.* the Mediterranean and the Atlantic. NE and Odyssey are based on yarns of Tartessian sailors (*Language* 1, 17^{i}). For *lîṭu* cf. GB^{17}, 381^{b}, l. 4. In 2 S 18, 5 we must read: *lôṭ* (GK^{28} § 113, bb) *lî lan-náʿr*, guard (*φείσασθε, servate, istĕmírû*) the boy. Arab. *láṭṭa* = *sátara*. For Ass. *lîṭu*, hostage, cf. Arab. *anâṭa*, to surrender, and *manûṭ* (JHUC 320, 51, Ap. 3).

Professor WALTER E. CLARK, of the University of Chicago: Alberuni's quotations from the Bhagavadgītā. Remarks by Professors Edgerton and Barret.

Professor CHARLES C. TORREY, of Yale University: A Specimen of Old Aramaic Verse. Remarks by Professors Haupt and Newbold.

Professor MAX L. MARGOLIS, of the Dropsie College: In Psalm 49: 6 read *ʿēn* instead of *ʿaṿōn*.

At this point an address of welcome was delivered by President Cyrus Adler of the Dropsie College.

The session adjourned at 12.42 p. m.

THE FOURTH SESSION

The fourth session was called to order at 2.42 o'clock on Thursday afternoon at the Dropsie College; the reading of papers was immediately begun.

Professor A. T. OLMSTEAD, of the University of Illinois: The Oriental Museum of the University of Illinois.

Although small, this museum possesses some valuable collections. The most important includes nearly a hundred seal cylinders and seals, mostly Babylonian, but with examples from Asia Minor and the Urumia region. Every date from the earliest to the post-Christian is represented. Seventeen hundred tablets, largely from Drehem, Jokha, and Senkereh, date from Dungi to Darius I. Other objects include a small alabaster Gudea, inscriptions of Gudea, Ibi Sin, Nebuchadnezzar. Two curious Hittite objects are of unknown use. Egyptian pottery, weights, palettes, statuettes, a stucco painting from Amarna, come through the Egypt Exploration Society. The best Egyptian pieces are a beautiful head in diorite and a large bronze representing a Ptolemaic queen as a goddess.

Rev. Dr. JUSTIN E. ABBOTT, of Summit, N. J.: The Vyankatesha Stotra, or Prayer of Devadāsa. Remarks by Professors Clark and Edgerton.

The Yale University Library contains four Marathi manuscripts. Among them is the Vyankatesha stotra by Devadāsa. The manuscript has the appearance of being about 200 years old. This prayer is in the *ovi* meter and consists of 100 verses. Devadāsa was a Maratha Saint somewhere in the 17th century. The Vyankatesha stotra is a popular poem and is said to be frequently committed to memory. The following are a few samples of its verses. "O My Lord, Thou who hast the form of light, give me the inspiration to compose this book, so that the hearer may enjoy it." "Does a mother refuse comfort to a son though guilty of a thousand faults? So be merciful to me, O Govinda, Thou my Mother and my Father." "I am a sinner in truth, but Thou art the Saviour of the sinner." "Give me this blessing, that I may be kind to others."

Professor GEORGE A. BARTON, of the University of Pennsylvania: Light on the origin and early history of Nin-IB (Nin-urta, Nin-urash). Remarks by President Morgenstern and Professor Kent.

The name cannot be traced earlier than the time of the last dynasty of Ur. Late syllabaries identify this deity with many others, a num-

ber of which appear to be agricultural, as e. g. *ãka-lum-ma*, "the date deity." Evidence is presented in the paper to show that in the time of the Ur dynasty this deity was an agricultural goddess, the consort of Nuzku (Nusku), the fire god, and that probably originally Nuzku was a sun-god and Nin-IB an earth-goddess.

Rev. GEORGE W. BRIGGS, of Drew Theological Seminary: The Date of Gorakhnath. Remarks by Professor Edgerton and Dr. Abbott.

President JULIAN MORGENSTERN, of the Hebrew Union College: The Passover-Mazzoth Festival in the Biblical period. Remarks by Dr. Ogden.

Scholars have generally recognized that the Biblical Passover Festival developed out of a combination of two Festivals, originally independent of each other, the Passover Festival rooted in the primitive pastoral life, beliefs and practices of the early nomadic Israelites, and the Mazzoth Festival indigenous to the agricultural life and religious belief and practice of the pre-Israelite Canaanite inhabitants of Palestine. The original Passover Festival was celebrated in connection with the appearance of the new moon. The original Mazzoth Festival was celebrated at the time of the spring equinox. Ultimately, these two unrelated Festivals were combined. When did this combination take place? And under what conditions and for what purposes? What was the subsequent history of the Festival after this combination during the Biblical period?

Professor FRANKLIN EDGERTON, of the University of Pennsylvania: The Hour of Death, its importance for man's future state, in Indic and Western religions. Remarks by Dr. Abbott and Professor Barret.

A preliminary report of a study on the importance, in determining man's fate in a future life, of (1) the *time* of death, (2) the *place*, and (3) the *state of mind* of the dying man (often conceived as established by repetition of a divine name or sacred formula). Strikingly similar views on all three subjects are found in Hindu and western (Christian or Jewish) beliefs; traces of like ideas seem also to occur in Zoroastrianism and in Chinese religions. The author of this paper is trying to trace the history of these ideas and to understand their psychological basis.

At this point the following resolution was offered and unanimously adopted:

The American Oriental Society desires to express to Professor Franklin Edgerton its appreciation of his labors as Editor of its Journal, to which task he has for more than seven years devoted so much energy and so great an amount of scholarly ability and acumen, thus contributing to the advance of oriental scholarship in the United States.

Professor GEORGE R. BERRY, of Colgate University: Messianic Predictions in the Old Testament. Remarks by President Morgenstern, Professor Meek and Mr. Dembitz.

Dating of Messianic predictions. Messianic predictions relatively unimportant. Not found in the majority of the prophets. Some opposition to the idea. When found, ordinarily overshadowed by the theocratic feature. Most Messianic predictions dynastic. Special consideration of Is. 9: 1-6. Textual question in this passage. Ideal element in Is. 11: 1-5. Summary of conclusions.

Miss L. C. G. GRIEVE, of Staten Island, N. Y.: Stamping-seals of the Vaishnavites.

Rev. CARL H. KRAELING, of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia: The Odes of Solomon and the Proto-gnostic hymns of the Manichean and Mandean Liturgies. Remarks by Professor Schmidt.

The paper is to continue the line of inquiry indicated by Rendel Harris in his most recent edition of the Odes of Solomon, but to call attention to parallels in thought and language between the Odes and two collections of Hymns, Manichean and Mandean, not previously considered. These parallels merit consideration because the Mandean sect, with which Mani too was connected, seems to have originated in northern Palestine, i. e. in the general sphere whence the Odes come. The Mandeans harbor traditions connecting them with the first century A. D., and both Mandeans and Manicheans are more closely in contact with the ancient Orient than the other Gnostic sects. This seems to argue not only for Harris' first century dating of the Odes, but points to the existence of a Proto-Gnostic sphere of thought, the acceptance and re-creation of which would be of importance in explaining a number of the religious phenomena of the Orient in early Christian times.

Mr. N. B. PARULEKHAR, of Columbia University: The Atheistic School of Indian Philosophy.

In the history of thought atheism is as old as theism or any other form of theology. In India atheism is mentioned from very early times, in Upanishads, Mahabharata, and in treatises on philosophy. In later times atheism was recognized as a system of philosophy. As theology in India is only a minor issue, the odium of atheism did not fall so much on those who denied god as on those who denied inference. The Charwakas maintained unqualified sensationalism in epistemology and ethics. This was the backbone of their atheism or Nastika-mata. It is remarkable that the minority of atheists in India were treated with tolerance.

The session adjourned at 5.05 p. m.

On Wednesday evening the members of the Society were most

hospitably entertained by Mr. John Frederick Lewis, President of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, and Mrs. Lewis at their residence, where Mr. Lewis showed them his collection of Oriental miniatures.

THE FIFTH SESSION

The fifth session was called to order at 9.30 o'clock on Friday morning at the University of Pennsylvania.

It was reported that the Directors had decided to meet Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of Easter Week, April 19, 20 and 21, 1927, in Cincinnati, at the invitation of the Hebrew Union College, the sessions to be a joint meeting with the Middle West Branch of the Society.

Amendment to By-Laws

On motion the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, that the following be substituted for the present By-Law VI, to take effect on Jan. 1, 1927.

Each corporate member shall pay into the treasury of the Society an annual assessment of five dollars; but shall be exempted from obligation to make this payment (a) in case he or she shall have made at any one time a donation of one hundred dollars during the first decade of membership, or (b) of seventy-five dollars during the second decade, or (c) of fifty dollars during the third decade, or (d) of twenty-five dollars during the fourth decade, or (e) when he or she shall have completed forty years of membership, or (f) on application, if he or she, having been a member for twenty years and having attained the age of seventy, shall have retired from the active exercise of the teaching profession or of the ministry.

Report on the American Council of Learned Societies

Professor Montgomery made the following report for the delegates of the Society to the last annual meeting of the Council and on motion it was accepted.

The Annual Meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies was held in the Columbia University Club, New York, January 23, 1926, with an all-day session. This Society was represented by its two delegates Professors Gottheil and Montgomery. Also Dr.

Ogden attended, by invitation, as Secretary of one of the Constituent Organizations, he having also attended a meeting of the Secretaries of all these Organizations called by the Council for the day before.

The subjects discussed in this meeting indicate the current interests of the Council. Reports were received from Standing Committees on the following subjects:

Corpus Vasorum, Dictionary of Mediaeval Latin, Dictionary of Late British Mediaeval Latin, Mediaeval Latin Studies, Distribution of American Learned Publications (i. e. among the impoverished institutions and scholars of Europe), Catalogue of Foreign MSS. in American Libraries.

Report was made on the Dictionary of American Biography (to be published under Mr. Ochs's subvention), on the Survey of Research (see below), and, as 'projects already presented,' the Edition of Guido delle Colonne and the Corpus of Monuments of Classical Antiquity.

'New Proposals' to the Council were:

Index to Vols. 1-40 of Modern Language Notes, Research in Teaching in English, Research in the history of the Calendar and in the history of early Greek Philosophy and Science, Organization of Research in social and intellectual relations between Europe and America.

A Handbook of American Learned and Scientific Societies and Institutions was considered.

Relations with the Union Académique Internationale (between which and American scholarship this Council is the link) were discussed. Proposals from abroad were considered for an Encyclopaedia of International Law and for Study of Indonesian Customary Law. Relations with the American Committee on Intellectual Cooperation were considered, and notice was taken of the coming International Congress of Philosophers at Cambridge, Mass.

It was announced that Professor F. A. Ogg (Wisconsin), Secretary of the Political Science Association, has consented to accept the Directorship of the Survey of Research to be made next year by the Council under the subvention from the Carnegie Corporation.

A fund of $5000 per annum for three years in aid of Research has been given by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, the Committee in charge of its distribution consisting of Professors Ford (Minnesota), Gay (Harvard), Greenlaw (Johns Hopkins), Laing (Chicago), Woodbridge (Columbia).

Since this meeting a circular letter has been sent by Director Ogg to all members of the Constituent Organizations containing a Questionnaire inquiring into their special lines of research, past, present and future.

Under date of March 31, the Committee on Aid of Research has announced the subventions that have been awarded for research, the sum in no case exceeding $300. Of the 21 subventions granted 7 are in English History and Literature, 6 in American History and Politics, 5 in Mediaeval Studies, 2 in French Literature, 1 in German History.

It will thus be observed that, to all appearances, not one Oriental interest has been broached to the Council or considered by it.

The Corresponding Secretary stated that he had received from Professor Allen Johnson, editor of the Dictionary of American Biography, the suggestion that those interested should send to the offices of the Dictionary, 602 Hill Building, Washington, D. C., the names of orientalists no longer living.

On motion it was voted: that the Corresponding Secretary was instructed to apply to the American Council of Learned Societies for a subvention of $250. to procure the reprinting of Professor Haupt's edition of the Babylonian text of the Gilgamesh Epic, this work being now out of print and the publishers declining to reprint without a subvention of the above amount.

Professor Montgomery reported on the American School at Jerusalem.

Professor Barton reported on the American School at Baghdad.

The Corresponding Secretary reported for the Committee on the Library of Semitic Inscriptions that the Library would be a memorial to Professor Clay as well as to Dr. Nies and that the first works to appear would be Professor Barton's Sumerian and Akkadian Royal Inscriptions and Professor Mercer's El-Amarna Letters.

The Corresponding Secretary summarized the reports made to the Directors by their committees on Occasional Publications and Increase of Membership.

The President appointed as a Committee on the Nomination of Officers for the year 1927: Professors Fullerton, Sturtevant and Grant.

As Auditors he appointed Professors Grice and Latourette.

As a Committee on Arrangements for the meeting in Cincin-

nati in 1927, he appointed: President Morgenstern, Professor Lauterbach, Drs. Philipson and Finesinger, Rabbi Cohon and Mr. Alfred M. Cohen.

The following resolution was adopted:

The American Oriental Society desires to express its grateful appreciation of the hospitality so cordially extended to it by the University of Pennsylvania; to record its gratitude to President Adler and the Board of Governors of the Dropsie College, where some of its sessions were held; to acknowledge its indebtedness to Professor Montgomery, Mrs. Jastrow, Mr. Schoff and President Adler, who constituted the Local Committee on Arrangements, for the admirable manner in which the meeting was arranged and the needs of the Society were met; to render warm thanks to Mr. John Frederick Lewis, President of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, and Mrs. Lewis for the delightful reception given to the Society and the opportunity afforded to examine the oriental art treasures in their house; and to recognize the many courtesies received from institutions and citizens of Philadelphia at the meeting held in that city in the year of the Sesqui-Centennial Exposition.

The reading of papers was then begun.

Professor AARON EMBER, of the Johns Hopkins University: (a) The change of *š* to *s* before a labial in Egyptian; (b) Egypto-Semitic names for parts of the body. Remarks by President Morgenstern, Professors Kent, Haupt and Hitti and Dr. Bull.

(a) Eg. *spt*, lip < *špt* = Arab. *šafat*, Heb. *sāfâ*, Ass. *šaptu;* Eg. *sm*, plants, grass, herbs < **šm* = Ass. *šammu*, plant, medicament, Arab. *šamma*, inhale, smell (Heb. *sam* and Arab. *samm*, poison, are loanwords from Aramaic); Eg. *sn*, inhale, smell < **sm* (partial assimilation of the *m* to the preceding dental, *cf.* Somali *sun*, poison < Arab. *samm*, and Hausa *suna*, name < Arab. *ism* and Heb. *šēm*) = Arab. *šamma;* Eg. *spr*, arrive, reach < **špr* = Arab. *šáfara;* Eg. *smḥi*, left side < **šmḥi* = Heb. *sĕmôl* (the *l* is here a secondary addition), Arab. *ša'm*, Syria, orig. north, left; Eg. *zṯr*, drink < **zbr* < **sbr* < **šbr* < **šrb* = Arab. *šáriba.*

(b) In spite of the early separation of Egyptian from the other Semitic languages it has, nevertheless, preserved many of the old Semitic names for the parts of the body. Some of these are preserved in Egyptian in the phonetic values of hieroglyphic signs, e. g. *'iṉ*, eye = Arab. *'aiṉ*, Heb. *'aiin;* *d* and *iḍ*, hand = Heb. and Arab. *iaḍ;* *iḍn*, ear = Heb. *'ózĕn*, Arab. *'uḏn*, Aram. *'udnâ*. Some are preserved only in a secondary meaning, e. g. *rs*, South, Upper Egypt = Heb. *rôš*, Arab. *ra's*, Ass. *rêšu.* A great many are found in Egyptian in their original significations, e. g. *ǧbʿ*, finger = Heb. *'eçba'*, Arab. *'açba';* *ns*, tongue (Copt. *las*) = Heb. *lašôn*, Arab. *lisân;* Eg. *ḫng*, hip-bone

(Copt. *alog*) = Ass. *ḫinçâ*, Heb. *ḥălāçāīm*, Arab. *ḥaçr; sbq*, leg = *šôq*, Arab. *sâq;* etc.

Professor MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, of the Johns Hopkins University: On Vedic *dhénā*, 'prayer,' 'song.' Read by Professor Edgerton in the absence of the author.

On the evidence of the passage *senendrasya* (*patnī*), *dhenā bṛhaspateḥ* (*patnī*), for which see Concordance, *dhenā* is the embodiment of Bṛhaspati's *sacerdotium*, to match *senā*, the symbol of Indra's *imperium*. The word, here, can mean nothing but 'prayer.' The vexed dual *dhéne*, which seems to overturn every proposed interpretation, is elliptic (dvandva ekaçeṣa), meaning 'prayer and libation.' The passages in which these two are associated are too numerous to count: *dhenā* figures very frequently in such combinations; see especially RV. 1. 141. 1, *dhénāḥ . . . sasrútaḥ*, 'prayer with oblations,' in relation to RV. 9. 34. 6, *gíraḥ . . . sasrútaḥ*. The last word is a compound with the associative prefix *sa*.

Professor NATHANIEL REICH, of the Dropsie College: The Egyptian agreements for the sale of landed property.

Professor THEOPHILE J. MEEK, of the University of Toronto: The bearing of Deuteronomy 32 on the form of Hebrew prophecy. Remarks by President Morgenstern and Professor Barton.

Many scholars maintain that the scheme of weal following woe is not found in pre-exilic prophecy, and hence would delete all the hopeful or promising passages as spurious. But in Deut. 32 we have very definitely the scheme of weal following woe, and the poem is clearly a unit and unquestionably pre-exilic.

Professor J. A. MONTGOMERY, of the University of Pennsylvania: The meaning of the much-tortured verb *rĕgaš* in Daniel 6, vv. 7. 12. 16 (English Bible, vv. 6. 11. 15). Remarks by President Morgenstern and Professor Kent.

This verb, translated dubiously by the Eng. VSS with 'assembled' or 'came tumultuously,' has been a crux since early days. The Gr. VSS conveniently omitted one of the cases, the Syriac, Vulgate and Saadia (in his Arabic translation) translated the verb differently in the three instances. Comparing the use of the verb in Ps. 2: 1; 55: 15, etc., and the use of it in Pesh. to Acts 5: 2 (AV 'being privy to it'), it appears to mean 'to have common consciousness,' and so implies common action as in a conspiracy.

Professor GEORGE A. BARTON, of the University of Pennsylvania: (a) On binding-twine and bitumen in Ancient Babylonia; (b) On the vocalization of the ideogram ŠES-ABki-MA; (c) Identification of the sign No. 572 of Barton's *Babylonian Writing*. Remarks by Professor Chiera.

(a) In AJSL, Vols. XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, the writer published translations of three Babylonian ledger accounts of reeds and wood, in which large quantities of reeds were enumerated as used for binding. The paper translates two other tablets, published more recently, which throw additional light on the use of reeds for binding-twine and for styli, and on the commercial uses of bitumen, and other articles of commerce.

(b) Although during the period of the last dynasty of Ur the above ideogram for the city of Ur is regularly written šES-ABki with or without MA, the syllabary gives the ideogram as šES-UNUki (CT, XI, 49, 30). This writing is also found in texts as old as the Larsa dynasty (cf. Poebel, UMBS, V, no. 2, col. 1 & 2; no. 34, col. iii, & xix). The writing šES-ABki was therefore obtained by omitting the three double wedges from the midst of UNU. The pronunciation doubtless was not changed. The MA is clearly a phonetic complement. UNU, then, became UN, and afterward UM. šES has also the value URU (S^b, V, 12). Doubtless, therefore, the ideogram was read URU-UMki-MA. Thus the ideogram was a phonetic spelling of the name of the city of Ur. These facts give us a new phonetic value of AB, viz: UM.

(c) The sign was tentatively taken as the representation of a gate and identified with no. 154. It is now seen to be a representation of an image and identified with no. 315, ALAN.

Professor PHILIP K. HITTI, of Princeton University: The Damascus Ms. of al-Baghdâdi's *al-Farḳ bayn al-Firak*. Remarks by Professor Montgomery and Dr. Ogden.

This unique manuscript kept in the Ḍâhiriyyah Library, Damascus, and recently published by the reader of this paper, is an abridged copy of al-Baghdâdi's *al-Farḳ bayn al-Firaḳ*. It is in the handwriting of 'Abd-ar-Razzâḳ ar-Ras'âni (whose biography is sketched by as-Suyûṭi in *Ṭabaḳât al-Mufassirîn*) and bears the date 647/1249. The author, al-Baghdâdi, died 429/1037 and his work antedates the well-known works of ibn-Ḥazm (d. 456/1063) and Shahrastâni (d. 548/1153. The manuscript is more accurate and better preserved than the more lengthy Berlin Ms. published in Cairo, 1910. It is the oldest and most authoritative source document we have on Muslim sects.

The following papers were read by title:

Professor PAUL PELLIOT, of the Collège de France and Columbia University: The discoveries of Colonel Kozlov in Upper Mongolia.

Professor WILLIAM ROSENAU, of the Johns Hopkins University: Judah ibn Tibbon as translator.

Judah ibn Tibbon (1120-1190) should be known beyond the circle of students of Rabbinical literature. Apart from his acquainting and keeping medieval and later Jews informed along the line of religio-

philosophical thought, by means of his translations from the original Arabic into Hebrew, Ibn Tibbon may be said to have created, through Arabic linguistic influence, a new lexicography and syntax for the Biblical language. This is proved when strange Hebrew forms are explained in the light of Arabic terms and idiomatic expressions.

Professor JULIAN OBERMANN, of the Jewish Institute of Religion: Form and contents of Ezekiel xiv.

The formal structure of this chapter is dealt with in terms of the metrical and strophical analysis of Ezekielian verse. On the basis of such analysis, this paper will re-examine the following problems: (a) the religious-historical connection between the teachings of the two literary unities contained in Ez. xiv., viz. 1-11 and 12-23; (b) the formal disproportion and substantial inadequacy of vv. 12-23; (c) the alleged contradiction between the postulates of Ez. xivb and Ez. xviii.

Rev. Dr. JOSHUA BLOCH, of the New York Public Library: The scope and contents of the Jewish Division of the New York Public Library.

Professor E. WASHBURN HOPKINS, of Yale University: Mysticism in Early Buddhism.

Dr. DAVID I. MACHT, of the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine: An experimental biophysical appreciation of (a) Deuteronomy xxxiii. 14 and (b) Psalms cxxi. 6.

Experimental work on different forms of light has shown the importance of certain radiations in the domain of plant physiology on the one hand, and in animal toxicology on the other hand. This work has an obvious bearing on the phenomena alluded to in the above passages.

Dr. ISRAEL EFROS, of the Baltimore Hebrew College: Some Glosses on the Hebrew Bible.

Rev. CONRAD W. JORDAN, of the Johns Hopkins University: (a) The Hero of Ephraim; (b) The name Israel.

(a) Zech. 10, 7 should not be translated *And they of Ephraim shall be like a mighty man*, but, according to Haupt: *they will be like the hero of Ephraim*, i. e. Jacob (Gen. 32, 29; Hos. 12: 4. 5; *cf.* JBL 37, 226). The story of Jacob's wrestling with a god is Ephraimitic (see Skinner's *Genesis* 404f). The original meaning of *Jacob* may be *descendant;* cf. Arab. *'âqibah, 'aqûb, mi'qab.*

(b) The original meaning of the name *Israel* may be not *God rules*, but *God flashes*, i. e. sends forth flashes of lightning; *cf.* Arab. *šariḳa* = *lama'a* (JBL 36, 141; 37, 222). The original meaning of *Iahyê* may be *Feller* = He who fells with his thunderbolts. Both *Israêl* and *Jacob* were originally Israelitish deities.

Mr. LEWIS CALVIN MOON, of the Johns Hopkins University: (a) A Chinese parallel to Arab. *naqâ'ah* and *baiâḍ*, 'whiteness' = leprosy; (b) A German parallel to Is. 63, 1-6.

(a) Haupt has shown (JAOS 43, 163, c) that Heb. *çarā'ṯ*, leprosy, which was also used for frambœsia, corresponds to Arab. *naqâ'ah*, whiteness; *cf.* Ex. 4, 6; Num. 12, 10; 2 K. 5, 27 and the line *whiter than white is the leper* in the Chinese poem quoted in *A Quatrain of Ling Tai Fu's* (Donn Byrne, *Changeling and other Stories*, 1923, p. 355). Also Arab. *baiâḍ*, whiteness, is used for *leprosy*. The Ethiopic equivalent of Heb. *çarā'ṯ* is *çerné't*, eruption, exanthema.

(b) A parallel to the Maccabean poem in Is. 63, 1-6, translated by Haupt in JHUC 163, 49, is Ernst Moritz Arndt's song on the Battle of Leipsic (1813): *Wo kommst du her in dem roten Kleid | Und färbst das Gras auf dem grünen Plan? | Ich komme her aus dem Männerstreit, | Ich komme her von der Ehrenbahn.*

Mr. FREDERICK A. BAEPLER, of the Johns Hopkins University: (a) Assyr. *bûlu*, 'cattle,' and *bêlu*, 'weapon'; (b) The etymology of Assyr. *ekêmu*.

(a) Assyr. *bûlu*, cattle, cannot be combined with Heb. *ʾēḇûl* (KAT[2] 540; GB[17] 109[a] l. 1) or with the stem *balá'* to swallow (KAT[2] 499) or with Heb. *bĕʿîr* (GB[17] 109; *cf.* Hommel, *Säugetiere* 143). According to Haupt, it is derived from the stem of *bêlu*, lord (Arab. *baʿl*, husband, owner; Eth. *bâl*, rich, possessor). The primary connotation of *bûlu* (= *buʿlu*) is *possession;* cf. Heb. *miqnê*, Arab. *mâl;* Gr. *κτῆνος*, Lat. *pecus* and *pecunia*, Eng. *fee* = Ger. *Vieh* (AJSL 3, 110). Assyr. *bêlu*, weapon, is not derived from the stem of *bêlu*, lord (HW 164[a]; AL[5] 158[a], l. 4) but is, according to Haupt, = *baḫlu* < *baḫâlu*, a transposition of Arab. *láḥaba* < *lḥ* > *láḥata*, *láḥaja*, *láḥima* (> Heb. *milḥamâ*, battle) = *qútila*, also *sállaḥa* and *silâḥ* (not = Heb. *šālḥ*).

(b) Assyr. *ekêmu* cannot be combined with Heb. *naqám* (KAT[2] 336) or with modern Arab. *ḥákam;* it corresponds to Arab. *má'aqa* = *járafa;* cf. our *swallow up* and Jacob, *Altarabisches Beduinenleben* 6, n. 4. *Má'aqa* is a transposition of *'ámuqa*. For *ekkimu*, violent (HW 57[a]) *cf.* Arab. *ɣáqama* and *áɣqama*.

Mr. SIDNEY I. ESTERSON, of the Johns Hopkins University: (a) Restoration of Zech. 9, 16. 17. (b) The alleged Hebrew verb *baḥál*.

(a) According to Haupt, Zech. 9, 16. 17 should be restored as follows: *Baʿiôm hah-hû miṯnôsăsîm baḫḫûrîm u-bĕṯûlôṯ kĕ-'aḇnê nezq*, at that time youths and maidens will rally around the banner (*cf.* Ps. 60, 6 in FV 280, n. 16) *like stones of a diadem.* This is a gloss on v. 13. The genuine portions of vv. 16. 17 should be read: *Ûĕ-hôšîʿám Ĵahɣê ĕlôhêhém | kĕ-çôn irʿém 'al-aḏmaṯô || maṭ-ṭûḇâh u-maʿiôp̃iâh | daḡán ɣĕ-ṯîrôš tĕnôḇéḇ*. We cannot translate: *Denn das Korn macht Jünglinge | Und der Most Jungfrauen sprossen* (AT[4]).

(b) We must read Zech. 11, 8, according to Haupt: *baḥēlâ* for

baḥēlâ. We have *mĕḇuḥḥālṯ* for *mĕḇôhālṯ* in Prov. 20, 21 (*cf.* 13, 11) Heb. *bahál*, to be uneasy, disquieted, is a privative (*cf.* NBSS 101) of Syr. *bĕhíl*, to be quiet. Modern Arab. *báhil*, to be stupid (cf. *inbáhal*, *áblaḍu*, *buhlûl* and Heb. *naḇál*, *nĕḇalâ*) = *bálih*, prop. quiet, secure, over-confident < *bl* > *bálbala*, incite, excite; *báliqa* = *taḥáiiara*; *bálaqa* and *bálhaqa* (< *sablaha*) = *ásra'a*. The emendations *ga'ălâ* or *ba'alâ* for *baḥēlâ* are gratuitous. *Ba'áltî* in Jer. 3, 14; 31, 32 < *ba'l*, lord, husband (JBL 34, 46, l. 8; contrast SATA²: Jer. 31, 32). There is no connection with Arab. *bá'ala* *'aláihi* = *ábâ* or *bağala* (= *hájjana*).

Professor WILLIAM ROSENAU, of the Johns Hopkins University: The meaning of Talmudic *haɥaiah*.

For the Biblical *ribh* and the Mišnic *maḥaloqeth* (rendered in Scriptures either 'division,' cf. Jos. 11: 23, or 'possession,' cf. Ezk. 48: 29) we find in the Talmud *haɥaiah* (from the stem *haiah*—Arabic *haɥā*), usually translated 'dispute.' The plural *haɥaioth* occurs in the phrase *haɥaioth d'Rabh uš'muel* (Berah 20. a), 'disputes between Rabh and Samuel,' and in the phrase *haɥaioth d'Abaie ɥ'Rabha* (Succa 28. a), 'disputes between Abaje and Raba.' Levy, Jastrow, Ben Jehudah in their dictionaries, Bacher in his *Exegetical Terminology*, and Strack in his *Introduction to the Talmud* translate *haɥaioth* as 'discussions.' Considering that the verb *haɥa* means both 'to be' and 'to fall' and that the construction *haɥa* . . . *b* signifies 'to fall against,' as against an obstacle or difficulty, *haɥaiah* means 'difficulty,' and *haɥaioth* should be rendered 'difficulties' in both the above passages.

Professor JULIAN OBERMANN, of the Jewish Institute of Religion: Verbs with *n*-preformative in West Semitic.

Professor AARON EMBER, of the Johns Hopkins University: Some Semitic, Egyptian and Hamitic Etymologies.

Heb. *šûq* and Arab. *šâqa*, desire, yearn, love, is connected with Arab. *šâqa*, bind, fasten.—Eg. *Fnḫu*, a designation for the agricultural population of the lowlands of Syria and Palestine = Arab. *falâḥ*, fellah < Aram. *pĕlaḥ*, plough, cultivate the ground.—Eg. *dbḥ*, entreat, implore = Heb. *zābaḥ* and Arab. *ḏábaḥa*, slaughter, sacrifice.—Eg. *sqb*, kind of tree = Heb. *šiqmâ*, sycamore.—Eg. *bꜣbꜣt*, cave and *sbꜣ*, door, connected with Heb. *bô* and Arab. *bâ'a*, enter; *cf.* Eth. *ba'at*, cave.—Bedauye *še*, hundred = Eg. *št*, hundred.—Eg. *pzḫ*, be dismayed = Arab. *fáza'a*.—Hausa *rene*, nurse, educate = Eg. *rnn*, raise ,educate.—Eg. *kršt*, kind of bread = Arab. *ǧarûšat*, coarsely ground wheat = Heb. *gereś*; cf. Hausa *gurasa*, bread.—Heb. *pādâ* and Arab. *fadâ*, redeem, liberate, connected with Eg. *fdy*, tear out, pull out; *cf.* Hausa *fida*, pull out.

Professor FRANK R. BLAKE, of the Johns Hopkins University: (a) The importance of the phrase in language study; (b) Differences between spoken Tagalog and the statements of the Spanish grammarians; (c) Connecting vowel *-â* after Syriac verbal forms in *-n*.

(a) The unit of speech is the sentence in the sense that man always speaks in sentences, complete or elliptical, but it would be better to apply the term unit of speech to the smaller parts which make up most speech utterances. These smaller parts or units are sometimes single words, but usually they consist of a word and one or more modifiers, i. e., a phrase. It is well known that the knowledge of the most important words of a language alone does not constitute mastery of the tongue. The student must know how to put them together, to form phrases and sentences. This syntax purports to teach, and this it fails to do with the maximum efficiency because of its neglect of the study of the phrase as such. Without a thorough knowledge of all the various kinds of phrases employed by a language a real command of the language is impossible.

(b) These differences concern spelling, accent, form, and syntax, and may be due to any of the following reasons: a) misprints, b) misinformation given by natives, c) misunderstanding of native statements, d) real differences between older and later language. While it is often not possible to determine the cause of a discrepancy, an attempt has been made to show which differences belong to (d).

(c) The chief forms that take this vowel before a pronominal suffix are: perfect 1 pl. *qeṭaln*, 2 pl. *qeṭaltôn*, *qeṭaltên*, 3 pl. *qeṭalûn*, *qeṭalên;* imperfect 2 sg. *tiqṭelîn*, 3 pl. *niqṭelûn*, *niqṭelân*. This *â* originates in 1 pl. originally *qeṭalnâ*, or perhaps both here and in 2 pl. fem., originally *qeṭaltenâ* (cf. Ethiopic *qatalkenâ-hû*), and is extended by analogy.

Professor A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, of Columbia University: On Turfan Pahlavi *miyazdagtāčīh* (Fragm. M. 17), as designating a Manichaean ceremonial offering.

The Society adjourned at 12.30 o'clock to meet in Cincinnati during Easter Week, 1927.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

MIDDLE WEST BRANCH

OF THE

American Oriental Society

AT ITS TENTH ANNUAL MEETING AT

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, 1926

In conjunction with the Chicago Society of Biblical Research, a number of whose members are also members of the American Oriental Society, the Branch met in the Virginia Library of McCormick Theological Seminary Friday and Saturday, March 19 and 20.

The following members of our Society were present:

Allen	Laufer	Sellers
Buttenwieser	Luckenbill	Smith, J. M. P.
Clark	Lybyer	Voigt
Denyes	Olmstead	Waterman
Eiselen	Price, I. M.	Wicker, Miss
Fuller	Robinson, G. L.	Wilson
Kelly	Schaeffer	

There were in attendance also the following candidates for membership:

Codrington, K. de B.	Hogg, W. E.	Seele, K. C.
Deane, J. P.	Lankard, F. G.	Siebens, A. R.

FIRST SESSION

The meeting was called to order at 2.20 o'clock Friday afternoon by the president, Professor J. M. Powis Smith. As a nominating committee the chair appointed Professors Olmstead and Allen and President Eiselen. There followed the reading of papers.

Rev. WILLIS E. HOGG, of Centreville, Michigan: The Foundation of the Second Temple.

Sources: I Esdras, Josephus, and OT. Best account is in Ezra 3, 1-4, 3; Haggai; Ezra 5, 2-15, the last two probably from the same hand. There is no date for founding and no statement necessarily meaning a

new foundation was ever laid. Work done in Hag. 1, 14; 2, 9 disproves claim of date as time in 2, 18. Work recorded in Hag. is too large for 20 days' activity. We must fall back on interrupted work of Ezr. 3, 8 ff. This work not on new foundation, but on that of Solomon's temple. *Šarîu*, Ezr. 5, 2 not "began," but "took upon themselves." First real erection probably was in closing years of Cambyses.

Mr. JOHN A. WILSON, of the University of Chicago: New Texts of the Battle of Kadesh. Remarks by Professor Olmstead.

Two new texts of the Battle of Kadesh between Ramses II and the Hittites have provoked a re-examination of this important contest. The new texts make the following contributions to the account of the battle: a) the garrison town of Ramses-Meriamon is in "the Valley of the Cedar," which is conceivably the Egyptian name for the *Bukā'a;* b) the Hittites, before the battle, lay "northeast" rather than "northwest" of Kadesh; c) Shabtun is only one *iter* from the Egyptian camp and therefore cannot be Ribleh. The latter point cuts down the time of Ramses' stand from three hours to one hour.

Professor EDWIN E. VOIGT, of Garrett Biblical Institute: The Jehovah Speeches in Job.

The second speeches of Jahweh and of Job have created a problem for most modern scholars in that they are inferior to the first speeches and fail to advance the argument. The new suggestion therefore is made that, just as in the Pentateuch and in other portions of OT one finds frequent occasions when variant accounts or readings are preserved, so the second dialog of Jahweh and of Job may have been the conclusion to the poem in one recension, while the first set of speeches was the conclusion in another, and the editors in compiling the book preserved both. This second set of speeches may represent the Alexandrian recension of the book.

Professor MOSES BUTTENWIESER, of Hebrew Union College: The Text-Transmission of Job: Common Archetype of the Greek and Hebrew Versions.

Professor A. T. OLMSTEAD, of the University of Illinois: Land Tenure in the Ancient Orient. Remarks by Professors Luckenbill, Schaeffer and Voigt.

Professor D. D. LUCKENBILL, of the University of Chicago: Sumerian and Akkadian Views of the Hereafter.

At six o'clock the members of the society were guests of McCor-

mick Theological Seminary at an informal dinner in the Seminary Commons.

SECOND SESSION

At seven o'clock the Branch met in the McCormick Chapel with a number of visitors present.

President JAMES G. K. MCCLURE of the McCormick Theological Seminary delivered an address of welcome. Professor Smith responded and the reading of papers was resumed.

Professor J. M. POWIS SMITH, of the University of Chicago: Archaeology and the Old Testament [Presidential address].

> A summary of the results of archaeology bearing on the OT field within the last quarter century. A discussion of the material discoveries and of the deductions based on these discoveries.

Dr. BERTHOLD LAUFER, of the Field Museum of Natural History: Selected Examples of Chinese Pictorial Art from the Imperial Museum at Peking and Field Museum.

> A discussion of the selected examples, illustrated wih colored lantern slides. A description of the culture and life of the people during the Sung period and the principal characteristics of Chinese painting, especially the landscape, from the Ta'ng to the Sung, Yüan, and Ming periods.

Professor T. GEORGE ALLEN, of the University of Chicago: Sunshine and Shadow along the Nile [illustrated with lantern slides].

> Similarities between ancient and modern Egypt, age-long tendencies, are often dwelt on. But Egypt, ancient or modern, is likewise a land of contrasts: physical sunshine and shadow; fertile valley, framed by deserts; massive pyramids, achieved by ancient statecraft and technical skill, half ruined by the later builders of Cairo; ancient precision in construction, modern inaccuracy; sanitation lagging behind the prospect suggested by the world's earliest drainage; over-population, bringing both arduous toil and idleness; luxury for the rich; filth for the lowly; camel and donkey still rivaling train and auto; modern longings inspirable by past glories.

Professor K. DE B. CODRINGTON, of the University of Cincinnati: Indian Archaeology [illustrated with lantern slides].

> India presents some splendid examples of ancient art and architecture, in many ways more meritorious than the better known productions of the Middle Ages.

THIRD SESSION

The third session was called to order in the Virginia Library Saturday morning at 9.22 o'clock. The reading of papers was resumed.

Mr. A. R. SIEBENS, of McCormick Theological Seminary: Light from the Theory of Law on the Problem of Deuteronomy.

The difficulties in the Deuteronomic problem lead one to seek light from sources hitherto not fully utilized. Such light is to be found in the field of historical jurisprudence. When codification takes place there is usually a process of elimination of the less desirable and a retention of the most useful customary laws. New law is seldom inaugurated by the codifiers. The origin of the individual laws that are retained necessarily varies widely as to time and locality, and the origin of a single law is not a safe criterion as to the origin of the code in which it is found.

Professor JOHN P. DEANE, of Beloit College: The Sayings of the Fathers, the Sayings of Jesus, and the Sayings of James.

Pirke Aboth, the Logia, and the Epistle of James are made the basis of a comparison of the Judaism of NT times, the teaching of Jesus, and early Christian teaching. The three documents have much in common, not only in form and subject matter, but also in spirit. The difference in the teaching of Jesus emerges in a freshness, a reality, an enthusiasm that is the expression of a fullness of religious experience and an immediate grasp of moral truth.

Professor A. H. FORSTER, of Western Theological Seminary: St. Patrick in Fact and in Fiction.

Professor LEROY WATERMAN, of the University of Michigan: Method in the Study of the Tetragrammaton. Remarks by Professors Luckenbill, Smith, Sellers and Allen.

The purpose of this paper is to state and endeavor to apply a scientific method of procedure in attacking the problem of the Tetragrammaton. Such a method calls for a listing, dating, and interrelating of all historic and traditional forms and vocalizations of the name. So far as this cannot be done accurately the problem is still insoluble. The phonetics of the Tetragrammaton cannot be solved by means of the late traditions and analogies of the Hebrew language, but only by applying the earliest phonetics discoverable. The application of these criteria appears to call for an original pronunciation *Yahwoh*.

Professor IRA M. PRICE, of the University of Chicago: (a) The Ships of the Gods. (b) Confirmation of Nabopolassar's Campaign against Harran. Remarks by Professor Allen.

(a) The gods of each country reflect the customs and beliefs of its leading people. The gods of Egypt travelled by boats; especially is this true of Re the sungod and all his retinue. In Babylonia, Sin the moongod was the heavenly sailor, while Ea the god of the sea was the chief authority on all that pertained to ships and shipping in the legends and myths of that country.

(b) A letter of Nebuchadrezzar confirms the word of the Chronicle of Nabopolassar regarding the campaign against Ḫarran in 610 B. C. and likewise names the ally of the king (of Akkad) as the Medes, in the Chronicle Umman-Manda, thus identifying the two names as one and the same.

Professor ALBERT H. LYBYER, of the University of Illinois: Present Educational Conditions in the Near East. Remarks by Professors Robinson and Deane.

The pre-war Ottoman Empire was remarkably well provided with systems of education, whatever may be true as regards their quality or the enlightenment of their pupils. At present the American Board is carrying as much work as possible, almost entirely with Turkish students. The Presbyterian work is proceeding along substantially the same lines as before the war. In all lands there is a marked increase in the interest of the people in education. During a rapid trip in the Levant last summer I visited as many American institutions as possible, including the American University at Cairo, that at Beirut, the American College at Teheran, Robert College and the College for Women at Constantinople, and the Sofia American Schools, not yet removed from Samokov. All are doing excellent work and are held in high honor by the people whom they serve.

Professor HENRY SCHAEFFER, of the Lutheran Seminary, Maywood, Illinois: Some aspects of the Prophetic Call.

A detailed study of the scriptural passages dealing with the call-experiences of the prophets shows that the religious interest predominates. Unlike the modern historian, the biblical narrator is little concerned with the prophet's antecedents, nor does he speak of "men who have made history." Biographical material is reduced to a minimum. The facts of the call-experience furnish instructive examples of the variety of the calls in Scripture. No less varied are the reactions of the several prophets to the call of service.

The following papers were presented by title.

Dr. A. R. NYKL, of Northwestern University: Japanese, Ainu, Tarasco, and Turkish Declension Suffixes: a Comparison.

Professor GEORGE L. ROBINSON, of McCormick Theological Seminary: Messianic Implications in Isaiah 63, 1-6.

The report of the secretary-treasurer was accepted.

On the recommendation of the nominating committee the following officers were unanimously elected for the coming year:

President: Dr. BERTHOLD LAUFER, Field Museum of Natural History.

Vice-President: Professor FREDERICK T. KELLY, University of Wisconsin.

Secretary-Treasurer: Professor OVID R. SELLERS, McCormick Theological Seminary.

Other members of the Executive Committee: Professors J. M. POWIS SMITH, University of Chicago, and MOSES BUTTENWIESER, Hebrew Union College.

It was voted to extend the thanks of the Branch to McCormick Theological Seminary for its hospitality in providing a place of meeting, two meals, and other conveniences for the members of the society.

The time and place for the next meeting was left in the hands of the Executive Committee.

After luncheon at the McCormick Seminary Commons the meeting adjourned.

LIST OF MEMBERS

The number placed after the address indicates the year of election.
† designates members deceased during the past year.

HONORARY MEMBERS

Prof. THEODOR NÖLDEKE, Ettlingerstr. 53, Karlsruhe, Germany. 1878.

Prof. EDUARD SACHAU, University of Berlin, Germany. (Wormserstr. 12,W.) 1887.

Prof. IGNAZIO GUIDI, University of Rome, Italy. (Via Botteghe Oscure 24.) 1893.

Prof. ARCHIBALD H. SAYCE, University of Oxford, England. 1893.

Prof. RICHARD v. GARBE, University of Tübingen, Germany. (Waldhäuserstr. 14.) 1902.

Prof. ADOLF ERMAN, University of Berlin, Germany. (Peter Lennéstr. 36, Berlin-Dahlem.) 1903.

Prof. KARL F. GELDNER, University of Marburg, Germany. 1905.

Sir GEORGE A. GRIERSON, K.C.I.E., Rathfarnham, Camberley, Surrey, England. Corporate Member, 1899; Honorary, 1905.

Prof. EDUARD MEYER, University of Berlin, Germany. (Mommsenstr. 7, Gross-Lichterfelde-West.) 1908.

EMILE SENART, Membre de l'Institut de France, 18 Rue François Ier, Paris, France. 1908.

Prof. HERMANN JACOBI, University of Bonn, Germany. (Niebuhrstrasse 59.) 1909.

Prof. C. SNOUCK HURGRONJE, University of Leiden, Netherlands. (Rapenberg 61.) 1914.

Prof. SYLVAIN LÉVI, Collège de France, Paris, France. (9 Rue Guy-de-la-Brosse, Paris, Ve.) 1917.

Prof. ARTHUR ANTHONY MACDONELL, University of Oxford, England. 1918.

FRANÇOIS THUREAU-DANGIN, Membre de l'Institut de France, Musée du Louvre, Paris, France. 1918.

Sir ARTHUR EVANS, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, England. 1919.

Prof. V. SCHEIL, Membre de l'Institut de France, 4bis Rue du Cherche-Midi, Paris, France. 1920.

Dr. F. W. THOMAS, The Library, India Office, London S.W.1, England. 1920.

Rév. Père M.-J. LAGRANGE, Ecole archéologique française de Palestine, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1921.

Don LEONE CAETANI, DUCA DI SERMONETA, Villino Caetani, 13 Via Giacomo Medici, Rome 29, Italy. 1922.

Prof. FRIEDRICH HIRTH, Haimhauserstr. 19, München, Germany. Corporate Member, 1903; Honorary, 1922.

Prof. MORIZ WINTERNITZ, German University of Prague, Czechoslovakia. (Prague II, Opatovická 8.) 1923.

Prof. HEINRICH ZIMMERN, University of Leipzig, Germany. (Ritterstr. 16/22.) 1923.

Prof. PAUL PELLIOT, Collège de France, Paris, France. (38 Rue de Varenne, Paris, VIIe.) 1924.

Prof. ALFRED HILLEBRANDT, Kastanienallee 3, Deutsch-Lissa bei Breslau, Germany. 1926. [Total: 25]

HONORARY ASSOCIATES

Field Marshal Viscount ALLENBY, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., Naval and Military Club, London, England. 1922.

Hon. CHARLES R. CRANE, 655 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.

Rev. Dr. OTIS A. GLAZEBROOK, American Consul, Nice, France. 1921.

Pres. FRANK J. GOODNOW, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1921.

Hon. CHARLES EVANS HUGHES, 1020 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1922.

President Emeritus HARRY PRATT JUDSON, 5756 Kimbark Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1922.

Hon. HENRY MORGENTHAU, 417 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.

†Hon. OSCAR S. STRAUS, 5 West 76th St., New York, N. Y. 1922.

Hon. SAO-KE ALFRED SZE, Chinese Minister to the United States, Chinese Legation, Washington, D. C. 1922.

Hon. WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT, Chief Justice, The Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D. C. 1921.

Major General LEONARD WOOD, Governor-General of the Philippine Islands, Manila, P. I. [Total: 10]

CORPORATE MEMBERS

Names marked with * are those of life members.

MARCUS AARON, 5564 Aylesboro Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1921.

Rev. Dr. JUSTIN EDWARDS ABBOTT, 120 Hobart Ave., Summit, N. J. 1900.

Pres. CYRUS ADLER (Dropsie College), 2041 North Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1884.

†Dr. N. ADRIANI, Posso, Central Celebes, Dutch East Indies. 1922.

Prof. AUGUSTUS W. AHL (Thiel College), 24 Packard Ave., Greenville, Pa. 1926.

Prof. S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR (Univ. of Madras), Sri Venkatesa Vilas, Nadu St., Mylapore, Madras, India. 1921.

Dr. WILLIAM FOXWELL ALBRIGHT, Director, American School of Oriental Research, P. O. Box 333, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1915.

Prof. S. M. ZAMIN ALI, M. A., Allahabad University, Allahabad, U. P., India. 1926.

Prof. HERBERT C. ALLEMAN, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa. 1921.

Prof. T. GEORGE ALLEN (Univ. of Chicago), 5743 Maryland Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1917.

Prof. OSWALD T. ALLIS, 26 Alexander Hall, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. 1916.

NAZMIE H. ANABTAWY, 1978 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1925.

Prof. SHIGERU ARAKI, The Peeress' School, Aoyama, Tokyo, Japan. 1915.

Prof. J. C. ARCHER (Yale Univ.), Box 1848, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1916.

Rev. ROBERT C. ARMSTRONG, Ph. D., 85 Asquith Ave., Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1926.

Prof. K. ASAKAWA, Yale University Library, New Haven, Conn. 1904.

L. A. AULT, P. O. Drawer 880, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1921.

Dean WILLIAM FREDERIC BADÉ (Pacific School of Religion), 2616 College Ave., Berkeley, Calif. 1920.

FREDERICK A. BAEPLER, Kongsberg, N. Dak. 1926.

MOSES BAILEY, A.M., 6 Norfolk Terrace, Wellesley, Mass. 1922.

Mrs. ROBERT A. BAILEY, JR., P. O. Box 654, Delray, Fla. 1922.

CHARLES CHANEY BAKER, 707 S. Bonnie Brae St., Los Angeles, Calif. 1916.

Hon. SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL.D., 44 Wall St., New Haven, Conn. 1898.

*Dr. HUBERT BANNING, 17 East 128th St., New York, N. Y. 1915.

Rev. Dr. JOHN J. BANNINGA, Union Theological Seminary, Pasumalai, South India. 1926.

Mrs. EARL H. BARBER, 42 Haven St., Reading, Mass. 1925.

*PHILIP LEMONT BARBOUR, care of Mercantile Trust Co., San Francisco, Calif. 1917.

Rabbi HENRY BARNSTON, Ph.D., 3515 Main St., Houston, Texas. 1921.

Prof. LEROY CARR BARRET, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1903.

Prof. GEORGE A. BARTON (Univ. of Pennsylvania), N. E. Cor. 43rd and Spruce Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1888.

Mrs. FRANCES CROSBY BARTTER, Box 116, Baguio, P. I. 1921.

Mrs. DANIEL M. BATES, 51 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass. 1912.

Prof. MINER SEARLE BATES, University of Nanking, Nanking, China. 1926.

Prof. LORING W. BATTEN (General Theol. Seminary), 6 Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1894.

Prof. HARLAN P. BEACH, 57 Madison Ave., Madison, N. J. 1898.

Rev. WILLIAM Y. BELL, Ph.D., 218 West 130th St., New York, N. Y. 1923.

*Prof. SHRIPAD K. BELVALKAR (Deccan College), Bilvakunja, Bhamburda, Poona, India. 1914.

Prof. HAROLD H. BENDER, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1906.

Rev. CHARLES D. BENJAMIN, Ph. D., Somerton, Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.

Prof. C. THEODORE BENZ, D. D. (Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 7304 Boyer St., Mt. Airy, Pa. 1916.

C. C. BERG (Univ. of Leiden), Hooge Rijndijk 96, Leiden, Netherlands. 1926.

OSCAR BERMAN, Third, Plum and McFarland Sts., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.

PIERRE A. BERNARD, Rossiter House, Braeburn Club, Nyack, N. Y. 1914.

ISAAC W. BERNHEIM, 825 York St., Denver, Colo. 1920.

Prof. GEORGE R. BERRY, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. 1907.

Prof. JULIUS A. BEWER, Union Theological Seminary, Broadway and 120th St., New York, N. Y. 1907.

Prof. D. R. BHANDARKAR (Univ. of Calcutta), 35 Ballygunge Circular Road, Calcutta, India. 1921.

WILLIAM STURGIS BIGELOW, M.D., 60 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. 1894.

CARL W. BISHOP, American Legation, Peking, China. 1917.

Prof. FRANK RINGGOLD BLAKE (Johns Hopkins Univ.), 1600 Park Ave., Baltimore, Md. 1900.

Dr. SHELDON H. BLANK (Hebrew Union College), 3332 Morrison Ave., Clifton, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1926.

Rev. Dr. JOSHUA BLOCH, 346 East 173d St., New York, N. Y. 1921.

†Prof. CARL AUGUST BLOMGREN (Augustana College and Theol. Seminary), 825 35th St., Rock Island, Ill. 1900.

Prof. MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1881.

Prof. PAUL F. BLOOMHARDT, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio. 1916.

EMANUEL BOASBERG, 1296 Delaware Ave., Buffalo, N. Y. 1921.

GEORGE BOBRINSKOY, 7023 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1925.

Rev. AUGUST M. BOLDUC, S.T.L., The Marist College, Brookland, Washington, D. C. 1921.

Prof. GEORGE M. BOLLING (Ohio State Univ.), 777 Franklin Ave., Columbus, Ohio. 1896.

Prof. CAMPBELL BONNER, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1920.

Prof. EDWARD I. BOSWORTH (Oberlin Graduate School of Theology), 78 South Professor St., Oberlin, Ohio. 1920.

Rev. JOHN WICK BOWMAN, M.A., 22 West Fayette St., Uniontown, Pa. 1923.

Prof. CHARLES S. BRADEN (Northwestern Univ.), 802 Windsor Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1926.

Dr. RENWARD BRANDSTETTER, Vonmattstrasse 52, Lucerne, Switzerland. 1923 (1908).

AARON BRAV, M.D., 917 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1924.

Prof. JAMES HENRY BREASTED, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1891.

Rabbi BARNETT R. BRICKNER, 8206 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, Ohio. 1926.

Miss EMILIE GRACE BRIGGS, Hotel Holley, 36 Washington Square West, New York, N. Y. 1920.

Rev. GEORGE WESTON BRIGGS, M.Sc. (Drew Theol. Seminary), Drew Forest, Madison, N. J. 1923.

Prof. C. A. BRODIE BROCKWELL, McGill University, Montreal, P.Q., Canada. 1920 (1906).

Rev. CHARLES D. BROKENSHIRE, Lock Box 56, Alma, Mich. 1917.

Mrs. BEATRICE ALLARD BROOKS, Ph.D. (Wellesley College), 9 State St., Wellesley, Mass. 1919.

DAVID A. BROWN, 60 Boston Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 1921.

Dean GEORGE WILLIAM BROWN, College of Missions, Indianapolis, Ind. 1909.

Dean OSWALD E. BROWN, Vanderbilt University School of Religion, Nashville, Tenn. 1926.

Prof. W. NORMAN BROWN, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1916.

Prof. CARL DARLING BUCK, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1892.

Prof. FRANCIS W. BUCKLER (Oberlin Graduate School of Theology), 140 Elm St., Oberlin, Ohio. 1926.

Dr. LUDLOW S. BULL, Assistant Curator, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1917.

ALEXANDER H. BULLOCK, State Mutual Building, Worcester, Mass. 1910.

Prof. MILLAR BURROWS (Brown Univ.), 262 Fifth St., Providence, R. I. 1925.

Prof. ROMAIN BUTIN, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 1915.

Prof. MOSES BUTTENWIESER (Hebrew Union College), 252 Loraine Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1917.

Prof. EUGENE H. BYRNE (Univ. of Wisconsin), 240 Lake Lawn Place, Madison, Wis. 1917.

Prof. HENRY J. CADBURY, 3 College Circle, Haverford, Pa. 1914.

ALFRED M. CAMPBELL, 6146 Torresdale Ave., Wissiminsing, Philadelphia, Pa. 1922.

Rev. JOHN CAMPBELL, Ph.D., 260 West 231st St., New York, N. Y. 1896.

Rev. ISAAC CANNADAY, M.A., Ranchi, Bihar, India. 1920.

Prof. ALBERT J. CARNOY (Univ. of Louvain), Sparrenhof, Corbeek-Loo, Belgium. 1916.

Prof. JOHN F. B. CARRUTHERS, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Calif. 1923.

Dr. I. M. CASANOWICZ, U. S. National Museum, Washington, D. C. 1893.

HENRY HARMON CHAMBERLIN, 22 May St., Worcester, Mass. 1921.

Rev. JOHN S. CHANDLER, D.D., Kodaikanal, South India. 1899.

Dr. WILLIAM J. CHAPMAN (Hartford Theol. Seminary), 155 Broad St., Hartford, Conn. 1922.

Mrs. HAROLD S. CHARTIER, 37 North Boulevard, Gloversville, N. Y. 1924.

KSHETRESHCHANDRA CHATTOPADHYAYA, M. A., Sanskrit Department, The University, Allahabad, U. P., India. 1925.

Dr. F. D. CHESTER, The Bristol, Boston, Mass. 1891.

Prof. EDWARD CHIERA, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1915.

EMERSON B. CHRISTIE (Department of State), 3220 McKinley St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1921.

Prof. WALTER E. CLARK, Box 222, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1906.

Miss LUCY CLEVELAND, P. O. Box 117, Times Square Station, New York, N. Y. 1923.

Rabbi ADOLPH COHLENZ, 2029 Eutaw Place, Baltimore, Md. 1926.

*ALEXANDER SMITH COCHRAN, 527 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1908.

Prof. K. DE B. CODRINGTON, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1926.

ALFRED M. COHEN, 9 West 4th St., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.

Rabbi HENRY COHEN, D.D., 1920 Broadway, Galveston, Texas. 1920.

Prof. SAMUEL S. COHON, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1917.

Prof. HERMANN COLLITZ (Johns Hopkins Univ.), 1027 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Md. 1887.

Dr. MAUDE GAECKLER (Mrs. H. M.) COOK, Box 175, Belton, Texas. 1915.

Rev. GEORGE S. COOKE, Wissahickon Inn, Redlands, Calif. 1917.

Dr. ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1917.

*Prof. DOUGLAS HILARY CORLEY (Vanderbilt Univ.), 2 Margaret Apts., Nashville, Tenn. 1922.

Rev. RALPH D. CORNUELLE, American Presbyterian Mission, Fatehgarh, U. P., India. 1922.

Dr. WILLIAM COWEN, 35 East 60th St., New York, N. Y. 1922.

Rev. WILLIAM MERRIAM CRANE, Ph.D., Richmond, Mass. 1902.

Rev. BERNARD CUNEO, 1500 34th Ave., Oakland, Calif. 1926.

Miss CECILIA CUTTS, Gooding College, Wesleyan, Idaho. 1926.

Prof. GEORGE H. DANTON, Tsing Hua College, Peking, China. 1921.

Prof. ISRAEL DAVIDSON (Jewish Theol. Seminary), 92 Morningside Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.

†Prof. JOHN D. DAVIS, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. 1888.

Prof. FRANK LEIGHTON DAY, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va. 1920.

Prof. JOHN PITT DEANE, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. 1926.

Dean IRWIN HOCH DELONG (Theol. Seminary of the Reformed Church), 523 West James St., Lancaster, Pa. 1916.

ARTHUR A. DEMBITZ, 1631 North 32d St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.

Prof. ROBERT E. DENGLER (Pennsylvania State College), 126 East Nittany Ave., State College, Pa. 1920.

Prof. JOHN R. DENYES, D.D., Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis. 1925.

NARIMAN M. DHALLA, M.A., 15 Royal Artillery Lines, Karachi, India. 1922.

Mrs. FRANCIS W. DICKINS, 2015 Columbia Road, Washington, D. C. 1911.

Pres. BAYARD DODGE, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Syria. 1926.

LEON DOMINIAN, care of the American Consulate-General, Rome, Italy. 1916.

Mrs. AGNES C. L. DONOHUGH, 31 West 76th St., New York, N. Y. 1926.

Dr. GEORGES DOSSIN (Univ. of Liège), 20 Rue des Ecoles, Wandre-les-Liège, Belgium. 1926.

Prof. RAYMOND P. DOUGHERTY (Yale Univ.), 319 Willow St., New Haven, Conn. 1918.

Prof. FREDERIC C. DUNCALF, University of Texas, Austin, Texas. 1919.

Prof. GEORGE S. DUNCAN (American Univ., Y. M. C. A. School of Religion), 2900 Seventh St., N. E., Washington, D. C. 1917.

Prof. CHARLES DUROISELLE, M.A. (Rangoon Univ.), "C" Road, Mandalay, Burma. 1922.

JOSEPH DURST, 136 Esplanade, Mount Vernon, N. Y. 1926.

Prof. FRANKLIN EDGERTON (Yale Univ.), care of Eastern Bank Ltd., Bombay, India. 1910.

Dr. WILLIAM F. EDGERTON, care of Brown, Shipley and Co., 123 Pall Mall, London, England. 1917.

Dean GRANVILLE D. EDWARDS (Missouri Bible College), 811 College Ave., Columbia, Mo. 1917.

Dr. ISRAEL EFROS (Baltimore Hebrew College), 3D, Alhambra Apartment, Lake Drive, Baltimore, Md. 1918.

Pres. FREDERICK C. EISELEN, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 1901.

Rabbi ISRAEL ELFENBEIN, D.H.L., 1018 East 163d St., New York, N. Y. 1920.

ABRAM I. ELKUS, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1921.

Rev. Dr. BARNETT A. ELZAS, 42 West 72d St., New York, N. Y. 1923.

†Prof. AARON EMBER, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1902.

Rev. WILLIAM C. EMHARDT, Ph. D., 223 West Mount Airy Ave., Mount Airy, Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.

Rabbi H. G. ENELOW, D.D., Temple Emanu-El, 521 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.

Prof. HENRY LANE ENO, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1916.

Prof. MORTON SCOTT ENSLIN (Crozer Theol. Seminary), 4 Seminary Ave., Chester, Pa. 1925.

STUART ALBRIGHT EPLER, 733 North Front St., Reading, Pa. 1926.

SIDNEY I. ESTERSON, 113 North Chester St., Baltimore, Md. 1926.

Rabbi HARRY W. ETTELSON, Ph. D., Parkview Hotel, Memphis, Tenn. 1918.

Pres. MILTON G. EVANS, Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa. 1921.

BENJAMIN FAIN, 1269 President St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1921.

Dr. SAMUEL FEIGIN, 100 North Fairmount St., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1924.

Dr. SHAMMAI FELDMAN, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1926.

Dr. JOHN C. FERGUSON, Peking, China. 1900.

Rabbi MORRIS M. FEUERLICHT, 3034 Washington Boulevard, Indianapolis, Ind. 1922.

Rabbi WILLIAM H. FINESHRIBER, 1916 Rittenhouse Square, Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.

Dr. SOL BARUCH FINESINGER, Hebrew Union Colloge, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1922.

Rabbi JOSEPH L. FINK, 599 Delaware Ave., Buffalo, N. Y. 1920.

Dr. LOUIS FINKELSTEIN, Jewish Theological Seminary, 531 West 123d St., New York, N. Y. 1921.

Prof. CLARENCE S. FISHER, American School of Oriental Research, P. O. Box 333, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1914 (1905).

Rev. FRED FOERSTER, Ph. D., First Lutheran Church, Jeffersonville, N. Y. 1926.

*MAYNARD DAUCHY FOLLIN, P. O. Box 118, Detroit, Mich. 1922.

Dean HUGHELL E. W. FOSBROKE, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1917.

Rabbi SOLOMON FOSTER, 90 Treacy Ave., Newark, N. J. 1921.

Prof. HENRY T. FOWLER, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1926.

Rabbi GRESHAM GEORGE FOX, Ph. D., 7423 Kingston St., Chicago, Ill. 1924.

Rabbi LEON FRAM, 8801 Woodward Ave., Detroit, Mich. 1926.

Prof. JAMES EVERETT FRAME, Union Theological Seminary, Broadway and 120th St., New York, N. Y. 1892.

W. B. FRANKENSTEIN, 9 West Kinzie St., Chicago, Ill. 1921.

Rabbi LEO M. FRANKLIN, M.A., 26 Edison Ave., Detroit, Mich. 1920.

Rabbi SOLOMON B. FREEHOF, D.D., Hotel Aragon, 54th St. and Cornell Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1918.

MAURICE J. FREIBERG, 701 First National Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.

Rabbi SIGMUND FREY, Feldgasse 10, Vienna (VIII), Austria. 1920.

HARRY FRIEDENWALD, M.D., 1029 Madison Ave., Baltimore, Md. 1921.

Prof. LESLIE ELMER FULLER, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 1916.

Prof. KEMPER FULLERTON, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio. 1916.

*Prof. A. B. GAJENDRAGADKAR, Elphinstone College, Bombay, India. 1921.

ALEXANDER B. GALT, 2219 California St., Washington, D. C. 1917.

Prof. FRANK GAVIN, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1917.

Dr. HENRY SNYDER GEHMAN, 5720 North 6th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1916.

EUGENE A. GELLOT, 290 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1911.

Rev. PHARES B. GIBBLE, 4 North College St., Palmyra, Pa. 1921.

Rabbi S. H. GOLDENSON, Ph.D., 4905 Fifth Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1920.

Rabbi SOLOMON GOLDMAN, 1357 East Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio. 1920.

RALPH GOLDSMITH, M. D., Medical Arts Building, Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.

Miss JANE F. GOODLOE, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md. 1926.

Prof. ALEXANDER R. GORDON, Presbyterian College, Montreal, P. Q., Canada. 1912.

Prof. RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1886.

KINGDON GOULD, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1914.

HARI G. GOVIL, India Society of America, 154 Nassau St., New York, N. Y. 1925.

Prof. HERBERT HENRY GOWEN, D.D. (Univ. of Washington), 5005 22d Ave., N. E., Seattle, Wash. 1920.

Prof. WILLIAM CREIGHTON GRAHAM, Box 2, Faculty Exchange, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1921.

Prof. ELIHU GRANT, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1907.

JACOB GRAPE, 1575 Abbottston St., Baltimore, Md. 1926.

BENJ. F. GRAVELY, P. O. Box 209, Martinsville, Va. 1925.

Prof. LOUIS H. GRAY, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1897.

Mrs. LOUIS H. GRAY, care of Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1907.

ROGER S. GREENE, The Rockfeller Foundation, 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1926.

M. E. GREENEBAUM, 4504 Drexel Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 1920.

Prof. ETTALENE M. GRICE, Babylonian Collection, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1915.

Miss LUCIA C. G. GRIEVE, 211 Wardwell Ave., Westerleigh, Staten Island, N. Y. 1894.

Rev. Dr. HERVEY D. GRISWOLD, 62 Rowsley St., Bridgeport, Conn. 1920.

Prof. LOUIS GROSSMANN, 3329 East Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, Calif. 1890.

Prof. LÉON GRY (Université libre d'Angers), 10 Rue La Fontaine, Angers, M.-et-L., France. 1921.

Babu SHIVA PRASAD GUPTA, Seva Upavana, Hindu University, Benares, India. 1921.

Pres. WILLIAM W. GUTH, Ph.D., Goucher College, Baltimore, Md. 1920.

*Dr. GEORGE C. O. HAAS, 29 Claremont Ave., New York, N. Y. 1903.

Prof. LUISE HAESSLER, 100 Morningside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1909.

Dr. GEORGE ELLERY HALE, Director, Mt. Wilson Observatory, Pasadena, Calif. 1920.

Prof. FRANK H. HALLOCK, D. D., Seabury Divinity School, Faribault, Minn. 1926.

Prof. CLARENCE H. HAMILTON, University of Nanking, Nanking, China. 1926.

VALDEMAR T. HAMMER, Branford, Conn. 1925.

Prof. MAX S. HANDMAN, University of Texas, Austin, Texas. 1919.

Dr. E. S. CRAIGHILL HANDY, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii 1924.

*EDWARD ROCHIE HARDY, JR., A.M., 419 West 118th St., New York, N. Y. 1924.

HENRY H. HART, J. D., 328 Post St., San Francisco, Calif. 1925.

JOEL HATHEWAY, 15 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. 1923.

Prof. RAYMOND S. HAUPERT, Moravian College and Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa. 1926.

†Prof. PAUL HAUPT (Johns Hopkins Univ.), 215 Longwood Road, Roland Park, Baltimore, Md. 1883.

Prof. A. EUSTACE HAYDON, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1922.

WYNDHAM HAYWARD, Box 367, Wickford, R. I. 1925.

Rev. Dr. JOHN HEDLEY, Methodist Episcopal Mission, P. O. Box 2956, Honolulu, Hawaii. 1926.

Rabbi JAMES G. HELLER, 3634 Reading Road, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.

PHILIP S. HENRY, Zealandia, Asheville, N. C. 1914.

EDWIN B. HEWES, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1922.

Prof. RALPH K. HICKOK, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y. 1924.

Prof. E. K. HIGDON (Union Theol. Seminary), 415 Pennsylvania Ave., Manila, P. I. 1926.

Prof. WILLIAM BANCROFT HILL, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1921.

Prof. WILLIAM J. HINKE (Auburn Theol. Seminary), 156 North St., Auburn, N. Y. 1907.

Prof. MASUMI HINO (Imperial Univ. of Kyoto), Kamigoryo, Kyoto, Japan. 1926.

Prof. PHILIP K. HITTI, care of Near East Colleges, 18 East 41st St., New York, N. Y. 1915.

Prof. CHARLES T. HOCK, D.D. (Bloomfield Theol. Seminary), 222 Liberty St., Bloomfield, N. J. 1921. (1903).

Prof. LEWIS HODOUS (Hartford Seminary Foundation), 9 Sumner St., Hartford, Conn. 1919.

G. F. HOFF, 403 Union Building, San Diego, Calif. 1920.

Rev. WILLIS E. HOGG, Geneseo, Ill. 1926.

*Prof. E. WASHBURN HOPKINS (Yale Univ.), 299 Lawrence St., New Haven, Conn. 1881.

Prof. JACOB HOSCHANDER (Jewish Theol. Seminary), 218 West 112th St., New York, N. Y. 1914.

Prof. HERBERT PIERREPONT HOUGHTON, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. 1925.

HENRY R. HOWLAND, Buffalo Society of Natural Sciences, Buffalo, N. Y. 1907.

Pres. EDWARD H. HUME (Yale-in-China), 401 West 118th St., New York, N. Y. 1909.

Prof. ROBERT ERNEST HUME (Union Theol. Seminary), 606 West 122d St., New York, N. Y. 1914.

*Dr. ARCHER M. HUNTINGTON, 15 West 81st St., New York, N. Y. 1912.

Prof. ISAAC HUSIK, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1916.

Prof. MARY INDA HUSSEY, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1901.

Rev. Dr. MOSES HYAMSON (Jewish Theol. Seminary), 65 East 96th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.

*JAMES HAZEN HYDE, 67 Boulevard Lannes, Paris, France. 1909.

Prof. WALTER WOODBURN HYDE, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.

Prof. HENRY HYVERNAT (Catholic Univ. of America), 3405 Twelfth St., N. E. (Brookland), Washington, D. C. 1889.

Prof. ABRAHAM Z. IDELSOHN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1926.

J. H. INGRAM, M. D., American Board Mission, Peking, China. 1924.

Prof. MOHAMMAD IQBAL, Ph. D., Oriental College, Punjab University, Lahore, India. 1926.

Prof. K. A. SUBRAMANIA IYER, M. A., University of Lucknow, Lucknow, India. 1926.

Prof. A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1885.

Mrs. A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, care of Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1912.

Prof. FREDERICK J. FOAKES JACKSON, D.D. (Union Theol. Seminary), Dana Place, Englewood, N. J. 1920.

Mrs. MORRIS JASTROW, JR., 248 South 23d St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1922.

Prof. ARTHUR JEFFREY, American University, Cairo, Egypt. 1923.

Dr. GEORGE JESHURUN, 5511 15th Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1925.

Prof. JAMES RICHARD JEWETT, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1887.

FRANK EDWARD JOHNSON, 31 General Lee St., Marianao, Cuba. 1916.

FRANKLIN PLOTINOS JOHNSON, 128 Lincoln Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. 1921.

Rev. FREDERICK WILLIAM JOHNSON, Westerhope Vicarage, Newcastle-on-Tyne, England. 1926.

*Dr. HELEN M. JOHNSON, Osceola, Mo. 1921.

NELSON TRUSLER JOHNSON, Department of State, Washington, D. C. 1921.

CHARLES JOHNSTON, 26 Washington Square, New York, N. Y. 1921.

REGINALD F. JOHNSTON, British Legation, Peking, China. 1919.

Prof. I. W. JOHORY, M. A., Christian College, Indore, India. 1926.

Rev. FRANKLIN JOINER, 2013 Appletree St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1925.
FLORIN HOWARD JONES, Saunders Cottage, N. Broadway, Upper Nyack, N. Y. 1918.
Rev. CONRAD W. JORDAN, 101 Sefton Ave., Hamilton, Md. 1925.
Rabbi LEO JUNG, Ph.D., 131 West 86th St., New York, N. Y. 1924.
Prof. MOSES JUNG (Univ. of Illinois), 625 East Green St., Champaign, Ill. 1926.
Dean MAXIMO M. KALAW, University of the Philippines, Manila, P. I. 1922.
Rabbi JACOB H. KAPLAN, Ph.D., 3326 Reading Road, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1918.
LOUIS L. KAPLAN, 489 Willoughby Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1926.
Rabbi C. E. HILLEL KAUVAR, D.H.L., 1220 Elizabeth St., Denver, Colo. 1921.
Prof. ELMER LOUIS KAYSER (George Washington Univ.), 2100 G St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1921.
Rev. Dr. CLARENCE E. KEISER, Lyon Station, Pa. 1913.
CHARLES FABENS KELLEY, The Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1926.
Prof. MAX L. KELLNER, D. D., 3 Concord Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 1886.
JOHN P. KELLOGG, The Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1926.
Prof. ROBERT J. KELLOGG, Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans. 1926.
Prof. FREDERICK T. KELLY (Univ. of Wisconsin), 2019 Monroe St., Madison, Wis. 1917.
Pres. JAMES A. KELSO, Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1915.
Prof. JAMES L. KELSO, Xenia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. 1921.
Prof. JOHN M. KELSO, 406 North Bradford St., Dover, Del. 1923.
Prof. ELIZA H. KENDRICK, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1896.
Prof. ROLAND G. KENT, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1910.
Prof. ANDREW KEOGH (Yale Univ.), 49 Huntington St., New Haven, Conn. 1925.
LEEDS C. KERR, Easton, Md. 1916.
Rev. ROBERT O. KEVIN, JR., Philadelphia Divinity School, 42d and Locust Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
Prof. FIDA ALI KHAN, M.A., Dacca University, Dacca, Bengal, India. 1926.
Prof. ANIS E. KHURI, American University, Beirut, Syria. 1921.
Mrs. HAROLD D. KINDT, Quakertown, Pa. 1924.
Prof. GEORGE L. KITTREDGE (Harvard Univ.), 8 Hilliard St., Cambridge, Mass. 1899.
EUGENE KLEIN, 44 North 50th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.
TAW SEIN KO, C.I.E., Peking Lodge, West Moat Road, Mandalay, Burma. 1922.
Rabbi SAMUEL KOCH, M.A., 916 Twentieth Ave., Seattle, Wash. 1921.
Dr. GEORGE ALEXANDER KOHUT, 1 West 70th St., New York, N. Y. 1924.

Rev. CARL H. KRAELING (Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 8000 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1925.

Rev. EMIL G. H. KRAELING, Ph.D. (Union Theol. Seminary), 132 Henry St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1920.

Rabbi NATHAN KRASS, D.D., Temple Emanu-El, 521 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1924.

Pres. MELVIN G. KYLE, Xenia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. 1909.

Miss M. ANTONIA LAMB, 212 South 46th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.

LEONARD D. LANGLEY, St. George Society, 19 Moore St., New York, N. Y. 1924.

Prof. FRANK G. LANKARD (Northwestern Univ.), 1909 Maple Ave., Evanston, Ill. 1926.

*Prof. CHARLES ROCKWELL LANMAN (Harvard Univ.), 9 Farrar St., Cambridge, Mass. 1876.

AMBROSE LANSING, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1921.

Prof. KENNETH S. LATOURETTE, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1917.

Dr. BERTHOLD LAUFER, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Ill. 1900.

Prof. JACOB Z. LAUTERBACH, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1918.

Dr. BIMALA CHARAN LAW, 24 Sookeas St., Calcutta, India. 1926.

SIMON LAZARUS, High and Town Sts., Columbus, Ohio. 1921.

JOHN W. LEA, 1520 North Robinson St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1924.

Prof. DARWIN A. LEAVITT, 641 Church St., Beloit, Wis. 1920.

Rabbi DAVID LEFKOWITZ, 2415 South Boulevard, Dallas, Texas. 1921.

Rev. Dr. LÉON LEGRAIN, University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.

ALBERT J. LEON, Hotel Ansonia, 73d St. and Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1926.

Rabbi GERSON B. LEVI, Ph.D., 919 Hyde Park Building, Hyde Park Station, Chicago, Ill. 1917.

Rabbi SAMUEL J. LEVINSON, 522 East 8th St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1920.

ABRAHAM J. LEVY, 6027 Ellis Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1924.

Rev. Dr. FELIX A. LEVY, 707 Melrose St., Chicago, Ill. 1917.

*JOHN F. LEWIS, LL. D., 1914 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.

Dr. ISADORE LHEVINNE, 232 West 112th St., New York, N. Y. 1923.

Rabbi LEON J. LIEBREICH, Temple Beth-El, Stamford, Conn. 1923.

Dr. H. S. LINFIELD, Bureau of Jewish Social Research, 114 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1912.

JOHN ELLERTON LODGE, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1922.

Prof. DANIEL D. LUCKENBILL, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1912.

Prof. HENRY F. LUTZ (University of California), 1147 Spruce St., Berkeley, Calif. 1916.

Prof. ALBERT HOWE LYBYER (Univ. of Illinois), 1006 West Nevada St., Urbana, Ill. 1917 (1909).

Prof. DAVID GORDON LYON, 12 Scott St., Cambridge, Mass. 1882.

ALBERT MORTON LYTHGOE, Curator, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1899.

Rev. WILLIAM H. McCLELLAN, S.J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md. 1922.

Prof. CHESTER CHARLTON McCOWN, D. D. (Pacific School of Religion), 721 San Luis Road, Berkeley, Calif. 1920.

Rev. WALTER T. McCREE, Streetsville, Ont., Canada. 1926.

Prof. DUNCAN B. MACDONALD, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. 1893.

Prof. GEORGE B. McFARLAND, M. D., Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Siam. 1926.

DAVID ISRAEL MACHT, M.D., The Johns Hopkins University Medical School, Monument and Washington Sts., Baltimore, Md. 1918.

J. ARTHUR MACLEAN, Director, The John Herron Art Institute, Indianapolis, Ind. 1922.

Dr. ROBERT CECIL MACMAHON, 78 West 55th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.

Dr. JUDAH L. MAGNES, 114 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.

Prof. HERBERT W. MAGOUN, 89 Hillcrest Road, Belmont, Mass. 1887.

Prof. WALTER ARTHUR MAIER, 3709 Texas Ave., St. Louis, Mo. 1917.

Prof. JACOB MANN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1921.

Rabbi LOUIS L. MANN, Ph. D., 5052 Drexel Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 1917.

Prof. CLARENCE A. MANNING (Columbia Univ.), 61 East 75th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.

*Rev. JAMES CAMPBELL MANRY, Ewing College, Allahabad City, U. P., India. 1921.

Prof. BENJAMIN MARCH, Yenching School of Chinese Studies, Peking, China. 1926.

Rabbi JOSEPH MARCUS, 301 Landis Ave., Vineland, N. J. 1924.

RALPH MARCUS, 531 West 124th St., New York, N. Y. 1920.

Rabbi ELIAS MARGOLIS, Ph.D., 16 Glen Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y. 1924.

Prof. MAX L. MARGOLIS, Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1890.

JAMES P. MARSH, M.D., 12 Whitman Court, Troy, N. Y. 1919.

Rev. Pres. H. I. MARSHALL, 1301 Center St., Newton Center, Mass. 1920.

JOHN MARTIN, North Adams, Mass. 1917.

Prof. NICHOLAS N. MARTINOVITCH, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1924.

Prof. ALEXANDER MARX, Jewish Theological Seminary, 531 West 123d St., New York, N. Y. 1926.

Rev. Dr. YOHAN MASIH, Malwa Theological Seminary, Indore, India. 1926.

†LELAND MASON, 6441 Church St., Los Angeles, Calif. 1925.

MITFORD C. MASSIE, 220 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1924.

Prof. ISAAC G. MATTHEWS, Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa. 1921 (1906).

Prof. JOSEPH BROWN MATTHEWS, Scarritt College for Christian Workers, Nashville, Tenn. 1924.

Rev. SILVANO MATULICH, 1500 34th Ave., Oakland, Calif. 1926.

Rabbi HARRY H. MAYER, 3512 Kenwood Ave., Kansas City, Mo. 1921.

Rev. Dr. JOHN A. MAYNARD, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1917.

Prof. B. C. MAZUMDAR (University of Calcutta), 33 1C Lansdowne Road, Calcutta, India. 1926.

Prof. THEOPHILE J. MEEK, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1917.

Dean SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Trinity College, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1912.

R. D. MESSAYEH, Stanton St., Dunwoodie Heights, Yonkers, N. Y. 1919.

Mrs. EUGENE MEYER, Seven Springs Farm, Mt. Kisco, N. Y. 1916.

Prof. TRUMAN MICHELSON (George Washington Univ.), Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D. C. 1899.

MERTON L. MILLER, 1812 South Bronson Ave., Los Angeles, Calif. 1921.

Rev. PHILO LAOS MILLS, D.D., 2315 Lincoln Road, N. E., Washington, D. C. 1923.

WALLACE H. MINER, 500 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1925.

Rabbi LOUIS A. MISCHKIND, M. A., 911 Washington St., Wilmington, Del. 1920.

UMESHA MISHRA, M. A., The University, Allahabad, U. P., India. 1926.

Rev. JOHN MONCURE, Maryland College for Women, Lutherville, Md. 1921.

Dr. ROBERT LUDWIG MOND, 10 Cavendish Square, London W. 1, England. 1921.

Prof. J. A. MONTGOMERY (Univ. of Pennsylvania), 6806 Greene St., Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa. 1903.

LEWIS C. MOON, 3107 North Charles St., Baltimore, Md. 1925.

Prof. GEORGE FOOT MOORE (Harvard Univ.), 3 Divinity Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 1925 (1887).

Rev. HUGH A. MORAN, 221 Eddy St., Ithaca, N. Y. 1920.

Pres. JULIAN MORGENSTERN (Hebrew Union College), 8 Burton Woods Lane, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1915.

*EFFINGHAM B. MORRIS, "Tyn-y-Coed," Ardmore, Pa. 1920.

Rev. OMER HILLMAN MOTT, O.S.B., 815 West 180th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.

DHAN GOPAL MUKERJI, 2 Jane St., New York, N. Y. 1922.

Dr. WILLIAM MUSS-ARNOLT, 245 East Tremont Ave., New York, N. Y. 1887.

TOYOZO W. NAKARAI, 509 Detroit St., Ann Arbor, Mich. 1926.

Prof. ARJUNA NATHA, M. A., Hindu Sabha College, Amritsar, India. 1926.

ALEXIS A. NENNSBERG, 1901 Minor Ave., Seattle, Wash. 1925.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAM M. NESBIT, 980 North Ave., New Rochelle, N. Y. 1916.

Rev. RALPH B. NESBITT, 59 Beauvoir Ave., Summit, N. J. 1924.

Prof. ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN, Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.

†Prof. WILLIAM ROMAINE NEWBOLD, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1918.

EDWARD THEODORE NEWELL, American Numismatic Society, 156th St. and Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1914.

Ven. Archdeacon WILLIAM E. NIES, Friedrichstr. 11, Munich, Germany. 1908.

Dr. WILLIAM FREDERICK NOTZ, 5422 39th St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1915.

Prof. ALOIS RICHARD NYKL, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis. 1922.
Prof. JULIAN J. OBERMANN, Jewish Institute of Religion, 40 West 68th St., New York, N. Y. 1923.
ADOLPH S. OCHS, The New York Times, New York, N. Y. 1921.
†Rt. Rev. DENIS J. O'CONNELL, 800 Cathedral Place, Richmond, Va. 1903.
Dr. FELIX, Freiherr von OEFELE, 326 East 58th St., New York, N. Y. 1913.
HERBERT C. OETTINGER, Eighth and Walnut Sts., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
NAOYOSHI OGAWA, Bureau of Education, Government of Formosa, Taihoku, Formosa. 1921.
Dr. CHARLES J. OGDEN, 628 West 114th St., New York, N. Y. 1906.
Dr. ELLEN S. OGDEN, "Resthaven," R. F. D., Milford, Mass. 1898.
Prof. SAMUEL G. OLIPHANT, Grove City College, Grove City, Pa. 1906.
Prof. ALBERT TENEYCK OLMSTEAD (Univ. of Illinois), 706 South Goodwin St., Urbana, Ill. 1909.
Prof. CHARLES A. OWEN, Assiut College, Assiut, Egypt. 1921.
LUTHER PARKER, Cabanatuan, P. I. 1922.
N. B. PARULEKHAR, 500 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1926.
ANTONIO M. PATERNO, 453 P. Gomez St., Manila, P. I. 1922.
Prof. LEWIS B. PATON, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. 1894.
ROBERT LEET PATTERSON, 1703 Oliver Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1920.
Pres. CHARLES T. PAUL, College of Missions, Indianapolis, Ind. 1921.
Dr. JAL DASTUR CURSETJI PAVRY, Connaught Mansions, Colaba, Bombay, India. 1921.
HAROLD PEIRCE, 222 Drexel Building, Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.
Prof. ISMAR J. PERITZ, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. 1894.
Prof. MARSHALL LIVINGSTON PERRIN, Boston University, 688 Boylston St., Boston, Mass. 1921.
Prof. EDWARD DELAVAN PERRY, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1879.
Dr. ARNOLD PESKIND, 2414 East 55th St., Cleveland, Ohio. 1920.
Rev. THEODORE C. PETERSEN, C.S.P., Ph.D., 2630 Ridge Road, Berkeley, Calif. 1924.
Prof. WALTER PETERSEN (Univ. of Florida), 750 Franklin St., Gainesville, Fla. 1909.
Dr. ROBERT HENRY PFEIFFER, S.T.M. (Harvard Univ.), 82 Larch Road, Cambridge, Mass. 1920.
Rev. Dr. DAVID PHILIPSON, 3947 Beechwood Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1889.
Hon. WILLIAM PHILLIPS, American Legation, Brussels, Belgium. 1917.
Rev. Dr. Z. B. T. PHILLIPS, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C. 1922.
Rev. MALCOLM S. PITT, 55 Rest Camp Road, Jubbulpore, C. P., India. 1925.
PAUL POPENOE, Box 13, Coachella, Calif. 1914.
Prof. WILLIAM POPPER (University of California), 529 The Alameda, Berkeley, Calif. 1897.
Prof. LUCIUS C. PORTER, Peking University, Peking, China. 1923.
Prof. D. V. POTDAR (New Poona College), 180 Shanvar Peth, Poona, India. 1921.

Mrs. FREDERICK W. PRATT, 2015 Columbia Road, Washington, D. C. 1924.
Prof. JAMES BISSETT PRATT, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1925.
Rev. Dr. SARTELL PRENTICE, 127 South Broadway, Nyack, N. Y. 1921.
Prof. IRA M. PRICE, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1887.
Hon. JOHN DYNELEY PRINCE (Columbia Univ.), American Legation, Belgrade, Yugoslavia. 1888.
CARL E. PRITZ, 101 Union Trust Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
Rev. Dr. A. H. PRUESSNER, Gang Sakotah 10, Kramat, Weltevreden, Java, Dutch East Indies. 1921.
Prof. HERBERT R. PURINTON, Bates College, Lewiston, Maine. 1921.
Prof. CHARLES LYNN PYATT, The College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky. 1921 (1917).
Prof. G. PAYN QUACKENBOS (College of the City of New York), Northrup Ave., Tuckahoe, N. Y. 1904.
HEMENDRA K. RAKHIT, 500 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1926.
Dr. V. V. RAMANA-SASTRIN, Vedaraniam, Tanjore District, India. 1921.
WILLIAM MADISON RANDALL, M.A., Kennedy School of Missions, Hartford, Conn. 1926.
MARCUS RAUH, 951 Penn Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1920.
Pres. JOHN H. RAVEN (New Brunswick Theol. Seminary), 98 College Ave., New Brunswick, N. J. 1920.
Prof. HARRY B. REED (Northwestern Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 1852 Polk St., N. E., Minneapolis, Minn. 1921.
Prof. NATHANIEL REICH (Dropsie College), 309 North 33d St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1923.
Dr. JOSEPH REIDER, Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa. 1913.
JOHN REILLY, JR., American Numismatic Society, 156th St. and Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1918.
Prof. AUGUST KARL REISCHAUER, Meiji Gakuin, Shirokane Shiba, Tokyo, Japan. 1920.
Rev. HILARY G. RICHARDSON, 147 North Broadway, Yonkers, N. Y. 1926.
Rev. J. MERLE RIFE, 501 North Walnut St., Bloomington, Ind. 1926.
Prof. EDWARD ROBERTSON, University College of North Wales, Bangor, Wales. 1921.
Rev. Dr. CHARLES WELLINGTON ROBINSON, Christ Church, Bronxville, N. Y. 1916.
Prof. DAVID M. ROBINSON, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1921.
Prof. GEORGE LIVINGSTON ROBINSON (McCormick Theol. Seminary), 2312 North Halsted St., Chicago, Ill. 1892.
Rev. Dr. THEODORE H. ROBINSON, University College, Cardiff, Wales. 1922.
GEORGE N. ROERICH, care of Roerich Museum, 310 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1922.
Prof. JAMES HARDY ROPES (Harvard Univ.), 13 Follen St., Cambridge, Mass. 1893.
WALTER A. ROSELLE, 749 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1924.
Prof. WILLIAM ROSENAU, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1897.

*Julius Rosenwald, Ravinia, Ill. 1920.

Lessing J. Rosenwald, care of Sears, Roebuck and Co., Philadelphia, Pa. 1924.

Prof. Michael I. Rostovtzeff (Yale Univ.), 1916 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1926.

Samuel Rothenberg, M.D., 22 West 7th St., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1921.

Prof. George Rowley, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1926.

Miss Adelaide Rudolph, 537 West 121st St., New York, N. Y. 1894.

Prof. Elbert Russell, Duke University, Durham, N. C. 1916.

Prof. Lemuel Sadoc, Ph.D., St. Stephen's College, Delhi, India. 1926.

Dr. Najeeb M. Saleeby, P. O. Box 226, Manila, P. I. 1922.

Rev. Frank K. Sanders, Ph.D., Marmion Way, Rockport, Mass. 1897.

Prof. Henry A. Sanders (Univ. of Michigan), 2037 Geddes Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. 1924.

Prof. Kokileswar Sastri, M.A. (Univ. of Calcutta), 14/2 Serpentine Lane, Calcutta, India. 1926.

Mrs. A. H. Saunders, 552 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1915.

Prof. Albert J. Saunders, American College, Madura, South India. 1926.

Prof. Kenneth J. Saunders (Pacific School of Religion), High Acres, Creston Road, Berkeley, Calif. 1924.

Prof. Henry Schaeffer (Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 1606 South 11th Ave., Maywood, Chicago, Ill. 1916.

Dr. Israel Schapiro, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 1914.

Prof. Otto Scheerer (Univ. of the Philippines), P. O. Box 659, Manila, P. I. 1922.

John F. Schlichting, 8504 Woodhaven Boulevard, Woodhaven, N. Y. 1920.

Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1894.

Adolph Schoenfeld, 69 East 108th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.

Wilfred H. Schoff, The Commercial Museum, Philadelphia, Pa. 1912.

Rabbi Joseph J. Schwartz, 165 Whalley Ave., New Haven, Conn. 1925.

William Bacon Scofield, Worcester Club, Worcester, Mass. 1919.

Prof. Gilbert Campbell Scoggin, The Gennadeion, Athens, Greece. 1906.

Prof. John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1920.

C. Randolph Jefferson Scott, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1925.

*Mrs. Samuel Bryan Scott (*née* Morris), St. Martin's Lane and Willow Grove Ave., Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa. 1903.

Prof. Helen M. Searles, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1921.

Rev. Keith C. Seele, care of American Express Company, 55 Charlottenstr. W-8, Berlin, Germany. 1926.

Dr. Moses Seidel, 22 North Broadway, Baltimore, Md. 1917.

Rev. Dr. William G. Seiple, 125 Tsuchidoi, Sendai, Miyagi Ken, Japan. 1902.

Prof. O. R. Sellers (McCormick Theol. Seminary), 846 Chalmers Place, Chicago, Ill. 1917.

Hon. Khan Bahadur Chaudhri Shahabuddin, 3 Durand Road, Lahore, India. 1926.

VICTOR N. SHARENKOFF (Columbia Univ.), 241 Princeton Ave., Jersey City, N. J. 1922.

Prof. SRI RAM SHARMA, Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College, Lahore, India. 1926.

Prof. BHAGABAT KUMAR GOSWAMI SHASTRI, Ph.D. (Gourgopinath Temple), 28 Bonomali Sircar St., Kumartuli, Calcutta, India. 1926.

G. HOWLAND SHAW, Department of State, Washington, D. C. 1921.

*Dr. T. LESLIE SHEAR, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1923.

Rev. Dr. WILLIAM G. SHELLABEAR, 20 Whitman Ave., West Hartford, Conn. 1919.

Prof. WILLIAM A. SHELTON, Emory University, Atlanta, Ga. 1921.

Prof. CHARLES N. SHEPARD (General Theol. Seminary), 9 Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1907.

ANDREW R. SHERRIFF, 527 Deming Place, N. S., Chicago, Ill. 1921.

CHARLES C. SHERMAN, 447 Webster Ave., New Rochelle, N. Y. 1904.

Rev. JOHN KNIGHT SHRYOCK, Anking, China. 1922.

DON CAMERON SHUMAKER, 257 West 64th St., Chicago, Ill. 1922.

Prof. S. MOHAMAD SIBTAIN, Government College, Ludhiana, Punjab, India. 1926.

Rev. ARTHUR R. SIEBENS, 102 Boulevard Arago, Paris, France. 1926.

Rabbi JULIUS L. SIEGEL, 602 Washington St., Wilmington, Del. 1925.

Rabbi ABBA HILLEL SILVER, The Temple, East 55th St. and Central Ave., Cleveland, Ohio. 1920.

Rev. HIRAM HILL SIPES, Guntur, South India. 1920.

Dr. SOLOMON L. SKOSS, Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.

Prof. S. B. SLACK, 17 Barton Crescent, Dawlish, Devon, England. 1921.

*JOHN R. SLATTERY, 47 Avenue de l'Opéra, Paris, France. 1903.

Miss MARION W. SLEEZER, 360 West State St., Paxton, Ill. 1923.

Rev. H. FRAMER SMITH, 324 West Duval St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1922.

Prof. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, 43 Southeast Ave., Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1877.

Prof. J. M. POWIS SMITH, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1906.

Prof. LOUISE P. SMITH, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1918.

Rev. Dr. ELIAS L. SOLOMON, 1326 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.

Dr. E. A. SPEISER, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1925.

Rabbi LEON SPITZ, 151 Gilbert Ave., New Haven, Conn. 1925.

Rev. H. HENRY SPOER, Ph. D., St. Alban's School, Sycamore, Ill. 1926 (1899).

JOHN FRANKLIN SPRINGER, 618 West 136th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.

J. W. STANLEY, 5 Russell St., Calcutta, India. 1922.

Rev. Dr. JAMES D. STEELE, 232 Mountain Way, Rutherford, N. J. 1892.

MAX STEINBERG, care of Macdonell House, Sydney, Australia. 1921.

Rev. Dr. THOMAS STENHOUSE, Mickley Vicarage, Stocksfield-on-Tyne, England. 1921.

Prof. FERRIS J. STEPHENS, Culver-Stockton College, Canton, Mo. 1925.

HORACE STERN, 1524 North 16th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.

Rev. Dr. ANSON PHELPS STOKES, 2408 Massachusetts Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1900.

Rev. Dr. JOSEPH STOLZ, 5010 Drexel Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 1917.

Prof. FREDERICK AMES STUFF (Univ. of Nebraska), Station A 1263, Lincoln, Neb. 1921.

Prof. EDGAR HOWARD STURTEVANT (Yale Univ.), 1849 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1924.

Dr. VISHNU S. SUKTHANKAR, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, P. O. Deccan Gymkhana, Poona City, India. 1921.

A. J. SUNSTEIN, Farmers Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1920.

Prof. LEO SUPPAN (St. Louis College of Pharmacy), 3422 Pestalozzi St., St. Louis, Mo. 1920.

Pres. GEORGE SVERDRUP, JR., Augsburg Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn. 1907.

Prof. YUNG-TUNG TANG, Southeastern University, Nanking, China. 1922.

Rev. CHARLES LINCOLN TAYLOR, JR., 6 Craigie Circle, Cambridge, Mass. 1926.

WESLEY F. TAYLOR, Box 423, Hastings, Fla. 1926.

Prof. WILLIAM R. TAYLOR, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1925.

Rabbi SIDNEY S. TEDESCHE, 200 Linden St., New Haven, Conn. 1925 (1916).

NAINSINH L. THAKAR, 359 Mosholu Parkway North, New York, N. Y. 1923.

Rev. Dr. GRIFFITHS W. THATCHER, Camden College, Hereford St., Glebe, N. S. W., Australia. 1926.

Prof. ELBERT DUNCAN THOMAS, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. 1926.

EBEN FRANCIS THOMPSON, 311 Main St., Worcester, Mass. 1906.

Rev. WILLIAM GORDON THOMPSON, St. Alban's Church, Highbridge, New York, N. Y. 1921.

Dr. WILLIAM THOMSON (Harvard Univ.), 32 Linnaean St., Cambridge, Mass. 1925.

Rev. Dr. MURRAY T. TITUS (Kennedy School of Missions), 258 Sisson Ave., Hartford, Conn. 1926.

Baron Dr. GYOYU TOKIWAI (Imperial Univ. of Kyoto), Isshinden, Province of Ise, Japan. 1921.

*Prof. CHARLES C. TORREY, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1891.

I. NEWTON TRAGER, 944 Marion Ave., Avondale, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.

Rev. ARCHIBALD TREMAYNE, 717 10th St. North, Seattle, Wash. 1918.

Prof. HAROLD H. TRYON, Union Theological Seminary, 3041 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1921.

VLADIMIR A. TSANOFF, Hartley Hall, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1924.

Prof. RUDOLF TSCHUDI, Ph.D., Benkenstrasse 61, Basle, Switzerland. 1923.

J. A. V. TUECK, 522 Linden St., Wilmette, Ill. 1926.

Rabbi JACOB TURNER, 4167 Ogden Ave., Hawthorne Station, Chicago, Ill. 1921.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE, 1732 Eye St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1925.

Rev. DUDLEY TYNG, 721 Douglas Ave., Providence, R. I. 1922.

*Rev. Dr. LEMON LEANDER UHL, Riverbank Court, Cambridge, Mass. 1921.

Rev. SYDNEY N. USSHER, 44 East 76th St., New York, N. Y. 1909.
Rev. JOHN VAN ESS, 5827 Maryland Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1921.
Rev. MAURICIO VANOVERBERGH, Kabugao, Apayao Prov., P. I. 1921.
Prof. ARTHUR A. VASCHALDE, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 1915.
Prof. AMULYACHARAN VIDYABHUSHAN (Vidyasagar College), 28A Telipara Lane, Shambazar P. O., Calcutta, India. 1926.
LUDWIG VOGELSTEIN, 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1920.
Prof. EDWIN E. VOIGT, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 1925.
Prof. JAKOB WACKERNAGEL (Univ. of Basle), Gartenstr. 93, Basle, Switzerland. 1921.
*FELIX M. WARBURG, 52 William St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
JAMES R. WARE, American University Union, 173 Boulevard Saint Germain, Paris, France. 1923.
Prof. WILLIAM F. WARREN (Boston Univ.), 131 Davis Ave., Brookline, Mass. 1877.
Prof. LEROY WATERMAN, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1912.
JAMES B. WEAVER, 412 Iowa National Bank Building, Des Moines, Iowa. 1922.
*Prof. HUTTON WEBSTER (Univ. of Nebraska), Station A, Lincoln, Neb. 1921.
BARUCH WEITZEL, 2445 Douglass St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
ARCHIBALD GIBSON WENLEY, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C. 1925.
Rev. O. V. WERNER, Ranchi, Chhota Nagpur, India. 1921.
ARTHUR J. WESTERMAYR, 14 John St., New York, N. Y. 1912.
President Emeritus BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, University of California, Berkeley, Calif. 1885.
JOHN G. WHITE, Williamson Building, Cleveland, Ohio. 1912.
Pres. WILBERT W. WHITE, D.D., The Biblical Seminary in New York, 541 Lexington Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.
*Miss MARGARET DWIGHT WHITNEY, 227 Church St., New Haven, Conn. 1908.
PERCIVAL W. WHITTLESEY, M.A., Highmount Ave., Nyack, N. Y. 1926.
*Miss CAROLYN M. WICKER, care of Rierson Library Art Institute, Chicago, Ill. 1921.
Prof. LEO WIENER (Harvard Univ.), 50 Buckingham St., Cambridge, Mass. 1926.
PETER WIERNIK, 233 East Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1920.
HERMAN WILE, 566 Richmond Ave., Buffalo, N. Y. 1920.
Rev. A. L. WILEY, Ph.D., Ratnagiri, India. 1926.
Prof. HERBERT L. WILLETT (Univ. of Chicago), 77 West Washington St., Chicago, Ill. 1917.
Mrs. CAROLINE RANSOM WILLIAMS, The Chesbrough Dwellings, Toledo, Ohio. 1912.
Prof. CHARLES ALLYN WILLIAMS (Univ. of Illinois), 714 West Nevada St., Urbana, Ill. 1925.
Hon. E. T. WILLIAMS (Univ. of California), 1410 Scenic Ave., Berkeley, Calif. 1901.

Prof. FREDERICK WELLS WILLIAMS (Yale Univ.), 155 Whitney Ave., New Haven, Conn. 1895.

Mrs. FREDERICK WELLS WILLIAMS, 155 Whitney Ave., New Haven, Conn. 1918.

Prof. TALCOTT WILLIAMS, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1884.

JOHN A. WILSON, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1924.

Rev. ROSS WILSON, M.A., "The Abbey," Lahore, India. 1926.

Major HERBERT E. WINLOCK, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1919.

Rabbi JONAH B. WISE, Central Synagogue, Lexington Ave. and East 55th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.

Rev. Dr. STEPHEN S. WISE, 23 West 90th St., New York, N. Y. 1894.

Prof. JOHN E. WISHART, San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Calif. 1911.

Rev. ADOLF LOUIS WISMAR, 419 West 145th St., New York, N. Y. 1922.

Dr. UNRAI WOGIHARA, 20 Tajimacho, Asakusa, Tokyo, Japan. 1921.

Prof. LOUIS B. WOLFENSON, 160 Canterbury St., Dorchester, Mass. 1904.

Prof. HARRY A. WOLFSON (Harvard Univ.), 35 Divinity Hall, Cambridge, Mass. 1917.

Rabbi LOUIS WOLSEY, 1400 Jefferson St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.

HOWLAND WOOD, Curator, American Numismatic Society, 156th St. and Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1919.

Prof. IRVING F. WOOD (Smith College), Northampton, Mass. 1905.

Prof. WILLIAM H. WOOD (Dartmouth College), 3 Clement Road, Hanover, N. H. 1917.

Prof. A. S. WOODBURNE (Madras Christian College), 441 Hamilton Place, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1926.

Prof. JAMES H. WOODS (Harvard Univ.), 16 Prescott Hall, Cambridge, Mass. 1900.

Prof. ALFRED COOPER WOOLNER, M.A. (University of the Punjab), 27 Lawrence Road, Lahore, India. 1921.

E. C. WORMAN, 5 Russell St., Calcutta, India. 1926.

Dr. W. WOVSCHIN, 1081 East 163d St., New York, N. Y. 1926.

Prof. JESSE ERWIN WRENCH (Univ. of Missouri), 1104 Hudson Ave., Columbia, Mo. 1917.

Rev. HORACE K. WRIGHT, Vengurla, Bombay Presidency, India. 1921.

Prof. MARTIN J. WYNGAARDEN (Calvin College and Theol. Seminary), 1116 Bates St., S. E., Grand Rapids, Mich. 1924.

Prof. ROYDEN KEITH YERKES (Philadelphia Divinity School), Box 247, Merion, Pa. 1916.

Prof. HARRY CLINTON YORK, Hood College, Frederick, Md. 1922.

Prof. MOHAMMED HAIMIDULLAH KHAN YOSE, Government College, Ajmer, Rajputana, India. 1926.

Prof. SOLOMON ZEITLIN, Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.

Rev. ROBERT ZIMMERMAN, S.J., St. Xavier's College, Cruickshank Road, Bombay, India. 1911.

Rev. Dr. SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, care of American Mission, Cairo, Egypt. 1920.

[Total: 625]

Central Archaeological Library,
NEW DELHI. 24557
Call No. A 330 US46
Author—Journal of the American Oriental Society
Title—
Borrower No. | Date of Issue | Date of Return